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Attachment A: Key submission themes and recommended amendments to the draft Auckland Film Protocol based on consultation feedback

Staff have worked through the detailed submissions received to determine and recommend changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol. Table 1 show key submission themes where change to the Auckland Film Protocol was suggested. For each key submission point a proposed staff response and recommended amendments to the Auckland Film Protocol are shown. Table 2 shows minor changes suggested to the Auckland Film Protocol by submitters where staff recommend that these changes be made for clarity. Table 3 shows a summary of themes where submissions indicated a broad level of support for the inclusion of these topics in the Auckland Film Protocol.

All recommended amendments to the Auckland Film protocol are shown in track changes in Attachment B.

**Table 1: Key submission themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of drones</td>
<td>Drones can be harmful to native birds, disrupting nesting and feeding. The potential negative effects, particularly on endangered native species needs to be prevented. Need to consider restricting or prohibiting filming in some locations at some times of the year.</td>
<td>The use of drones is regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority. Auckland Council as a landowner has put in place a Code of Conduct to regulate the use of drones in public open space. The draft Auckland Film Protocol included a new section on the use of drones for commercial filming and requires film makers to apply for a permit to film and to comply with the Auckland Council Code of Conduct and bylaws. As the use of drones for both commercial and recreational purposes has increased concerns about drone may be the result of both recreational and commercial use and the Protocol only manages use for the purpose of commercial filming. The Auckland Council Code of Conduct does restrict the use of drones around birds, to some extent; however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol. It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol. It is also recommended that Section 3.4.11 be amended to note that filming in some locations may be restricted or subject to additional conditions to avoid harm to native birds and to include additional guidance on drone use where native birds are present at a film location and reference to the protection of native species under the Wildlife Act 1953.</td>
<td>Amend Sections 2.3, 4.3.11 and Key New Zealand Legislation section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drones can spook livestock and horses; in some areas where horse riding is a common</td>
<td>The Auckland Council Code of does restrict drone use in proximity to livestock; however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol.</td>
<td>Amend section 4.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity this can result in safety risks for the horse and rider. The impact of drones on livestock and horse riders needs to be managed.</td>
<td>It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drones can cause concerns for other users and neighbours of public open space. Need to ensure that drone use does not impinge on the privacy of other users and neighbours and that it does not overly impact on other users’ enjoyment of public places.</td>
<td>The Auckland Council Code of does restrict drone use in proximity to other users of parks and over adjoining private properties; however, this was not restated in the draft Protocol. It is recommended that a summary of key provisions from the Code of Conduct is included in Section 4.3.11 of the draft Protocol.</td>
<td>Amend section 4.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screen sector submitters generally supported the need to permit and regulate the use of drones for commercial filming in public open space. Some submitters noted that other commercial uses of drones should also be regulated as it can result in negative public perceptions of drone use.</td>
<td>When a drone is being used for commercial filming purposes over public open space Auckland Council requires drone users to apply for a permit to film. This requirement is stated in the draft Auckland Film Protocol. Regulating the use of drones for other commercial purposes is out of the scope of the Auckland Film Protocol.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact on the natural environment| Overall most submitters agreed that it was important to ensure that the impact of filming on Auckland’s natural environment is managed and most public submitters felt that the Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming on the environment. However, some submitters felt that the Protocol should contain stronger messaging around the importance of respecting and protecting the natural environment. | The Auckland Film Protocol includes a number of sections which refer to managing the impact of filming on natural environments. To address submitter concerns it is recommended that section 3.9 be amended to include:  
  - stronger messaging about the importance of respecting and protecting Auckland’s natural environment  
  - clarify that film permits may be subject to conditions to manage effects of a film proposal and filming in some locations may be restricted or prohibited where the effects of a film proposal cannot be appropriately managed | Amend Section 3.9       |
<p>|                                  | There is a need to consider the environment impact of filming when assessing permit applications; including the potential impact of special effects on the natural environment.                                                   | Assessing the potential impact of filming on a particular natural environment or location requires the consideration of a range of factors, including but not limited to consideration of the nature of the film proposal and scope and scale of filming activity. While one film proposal may be able to appropriately manage the potential impacts on a particular location, another may not be able | Add a new section to Table One and amend section 4.10 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key submission points</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to appropriately manage the potential impacts on that same location. To recognise that the impact of a film proposal is assessed but varies dependent on a range of factors, it is recommended that: * a new section be added to Table One noting that assessment of environmental impacts takes into account a range of factors; * section 4.10 is amended to note that where special effects are planned the impact on the natural environment and wildlife will be considered and the use of special effects may be subject to conditions and / or restrictions.</td>
<td>Amend Section 4.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council regulates vehicles on beaches in the Auckland Council Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw and Council must also give effect to Policy 20(1) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. This is reflected in section 4.3.6 of the Auckland Film Protocol. To reinforce existing provisions on the use of vehicles on beaches it is recommended that section 4.3.6 is amended to state that vehicle use should where ever possible be avoided of kept to the minimum necessary.</td>
<td>Amend Section 4.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauri dieback</td>
<td>Most submitters agreed that it was very important to protect kauri and supported the inclusion of requirements in the draft Protocol. However, it was suggested that the Protocol needs to ensure that these requirements apply to all public open space.</td>
<td>To support Auckland Council efforts to protect kauri across the Auckland region it is recommended that section 4.3.4 be amended to ensure that conditions may be placed on film permits in any public open space where kauri are present.</td>
<td>Amend Section 4.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on native species</td>
<td>Most submitters supported the addition of section 3.12 and noted that it is very important to protect native species. However it was noted that the section largely focuses on biosecurity and suggested that the Protocol should contain more emphasis on protecting native flora and fauna, in particular native birds from the potential impact of filming.</td>
<td>The impact of filming on native flora and fauna is considered in a number of sections of the Auckland Film Protocol. To address submitter concerns it is recommended that section 3.12 be amended to note that the impact of filming on native flora and fauna will be assessed and filming may be subject to conditions and / or restrictions to protect native flora and fauna. Noise and lighting can have a negative impact on native birds. It is recommended that section 3.1.5 be amended to note that in some</td>
<td>Amend Sections 3.1.5 and 3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on access to public open space</td>
<td>Overall most submitters felt that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming on public open space. Some submitters noted that while some areas of an open space might be in use for filming, there was generally still plenty of space for other users. However, some submitters felt that filming had resulted in significant inconvenience due to restricted access to public spaces such as footpaths, local roads, parks, reserves and beaches.</td>
<td>Under the terms and conditions of a film permit film makers are provided with limited permission to occupy public open space. This means that the public are still able to access public open space, although access to some areas may be restricted for a period of time to avoid interruptions to filming and ensure public health and safety. This condition is not explicitly restated in the Auckland Film Protocol. The draft Protocol requires film makers to ensure (Section 3.1.3), unless expressly permitted, continued public pedestrian access. In addition, film permit terms and conditions require that film makers ensure access for residents, businesses and emergency vehicles are available at all times, that the public is not unduly inconvenienced and that public and private access ways are clear at all times. All part or full road closures, for the purpose of filming, are undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1974 and are publicly notified. For avoidance of doubt, it is recommended that sections 2.1 and 3.1 are amended to state that a film permit gives production companies limited permission to occupy and use public open space.</td>
<td>Amend sections 2.1 and 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Notification of local residents. Some submitters noted that they or other residents have been inconvenienced due to filming in their local area. Noting that filming may for example, restrict access to parking, footpaths.</td>
<td>Section 3.1.8 sets out minimum requirements for the notification of residents and businesses in the area impacted by filming, including in relation to road closures. Road closures (including closures of footpaths) for the filming are undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1974 and must be notified in printed news media.</td>
<td>Amend section 3.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key submission points</td>
<td>Proposed staff response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and some parts of a local park or to local roads. In contrast some submitters noted that they experienced filming in their local area and felt that they were well informed.</td>
<td>In addition to this Auckland Transport publishes information about road closures on its website. It is recommended that section 3.1.8 is amended to reference requirements for public notification by print media and that further information about road closures is available on Auckland Transports website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Wider notification of filming should occur to enable:**  
- Avoidance of areas where filming is taking place. Some submitters noted that residents travel some distance to access public open space for recreational purposes and can be inconvenienced if filming is occurring.  
- Interested residents of Auckland to watch filming on location. Some submitters noted that they would like to know where filming is occurring so that they have the opportunity to see filming on location. | Notification requirements in the Protocol focus on informing residents and businesses in the area impacted by filming. Wider notification of filming could reduce the risk of inconvenience to residents who may intend to use public open space but effective notification would be complicated by a range of operational factors including:  
- the date and / or timing of location filming is subject to change at short notice, as a result of weather and other considerations, and if notifications were not up-to-date it may not effectively inform potential users;  
- it would be difficult to put in place a single notification platform or media that would reach all potential users of public open space.  
Putting in place mechanisms for wider notification does not require an amendment to the Auckland Film Protocol and it is recommended that Screen Auckland consider potential operational approaches to achieving wider notification. | No change  
Screen Auckland to consider operational approaches to achieving wider notification. |
| Compliance and enforcement | Many submitters noted that while for the most part film makers act responsibly some do not and there needs to be:  
- a stronger emphasis on compliance in the Protocol;  
- a stronger focus on enforcement when production companies do not comply with their film permit, rules, regulations or policy of Auckland Council. There should be consequences and / or disincentives for those who do not comply. | The Auckland Film Protocol states in a number of places that film makers are required to comply with Auckland Council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit and that non-compliance may result in enforcement.  
Enforcement is limited to the powers available to Auckland Council under legislation such as the Local Government Act and the Resource Management Act to enforce breaches of bylaws and policies and plans like the Auckland Unitary Plan.  
To address submitters concerns it is recommended that sections 3.2 and 3.3 be amended to increase emphasis on compliance. | Amend Sections 3.2 and 3.3 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Consider the cost of providing public open space on top of open space fee and make the necessary adjustments to the fee schedule to reflect the cost of providing public open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on business**
- The additional cost of providing open space on top of open space fee likely to impact businesses who are in areas where FNM (Food Market) does not already exist. Overall most submissions feel that Auckland Council procedure is too complex and burdensome for small businesses.

**Recommended amendments**
- Add a new section to the proposed schedule to reflect the cost of providing open space on top of the open space fee. This will ensure that the necessary adjustments are made to the fee schedule to reflect the cost of providing public open space.
Table 2: Minor changes to the Protocol in response to submitter feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Submitter suggestion</th>
<th>Proposed staff response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waitakere Ranges Heritage Areas Act</strong></td>
<td>The draft Protocol made a small number of references to the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Areas Act. It was suggested that the Act needs to be referenced in a number of other parts of the document and that more information about the objectives of the Act should be included.</td>
<td>The Waitakere Ranges Heritage Areas Act recognises the national, regional and local significance of the Waitakere Ranges area. It is recommended that sections 2.1 and 4.2 are amended to refer to the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Areas Act and that the Key Legislation section is amended to include reference to the objectives of the Act.</td>
<td>Amend sections 2.1, 4.2 and Kay New Zealand Legislation section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screen Auckland Reserved Parking document</strong></td>
<td>Section 4.2.1 refers to the Screen Auckland Reserved Parking (SARP) document. It was suggested that this should be defined in the document.</td>
<td>The Auckland Film Protocol refers to the Screen Auckland Reserved Parking Document which outlines operational requirements when reserving parking areas for film activities. It is recommended that a definition be added to the glossary to state this.</td>
<td>Amend glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recces</strong></td>
<td>Reccees are undertaken to assess the suitability of locations for filming. It was suggested that the Protocol could be clearer that any filming activity undertaken during a reccoe must be low impact in nature.</td>
<td>Reccees are undertaken by screen production companies before a film permit has been granted to assess the suitability of a location for filming. It is recommended that section 2.3 is amended to include a new frequently asked question which clarifies that any reccees undertaken must be low impact and production companies must comply with the requirements of the Auckland Film Protocol during reccees.</td>
<td>Amend Section 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Summary of key support for topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Submitter views</th>
<th>Recommended response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on cultural heritage</td>
<td>Overall most submitters felt that the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming has on cultural heritage. Most submitters noted that it was important to ensure cultural heritage sites are treated with respect.</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filming on the water</td>
<td>Most submitters supported the addition of section 4.3.7, noting that health and safety considerations on the water are important. Note all those who commented on this matter were individuals or organisations working in the screen sector.</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and sustainability</td>
<td>Most submitters, including those submitters who work in the screen sector, agreed that it was important to minimise and manage waste to landfill and agreed that it was important for the screen sector to play their part.  Many of the screen sector submitters noted that they feel practice in this area is improving and agreed that it should continue to be a focus.</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Commitments</td>
<td>Most submitters were supportive of the streamlined Core Commitments section, although some submitters noted that it was important to ensure that the process of film permitting is also streamlined.</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who we heard from

The tables below show the demographic information that submitters provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified / not applicable</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha / NZ European</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands Māori</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Area</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% of Submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtahuhu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Auckland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

What Auckland offers
Auckland is now recognised as a world-class screen production destination, providing access to first-rate skills and talent, stunning locations, and exceptional production facilities.

The Auckland screen production industry caters for a wide range of activities, including feature films, television series, documentaries, commercials, photoshoots, animation, post production and visual effects.

How Auckland benefits
The economic importance of the film industry in Auckland has been growing steadily, bringing jobs and opportunity to those directly involved in the industry and positive impacts for the wider economy. This in turn leads to better social outcomes and improved quality of life for all Aucklanders.

Auckland’s growing film industry supports our aspiration, outlined in the Auckland Plan 2050, for Auckland to be prosperous, with many opportunities, delivering better social and economic outcomes for everyone. The Auckland Plan recognises that our economy needs to be innovative and agile and that international connectivity is key to our economic success.

Many jobs in the screen industry, particularly in the post-production sector are high-tech with innovation key to success. Television programmes, feature films and television commercials produced in Auckland are enjoyed by audiences all over the world. Showcasing Auckland to the world, enhancing our reputation, our sense of pride in who we are, encouraging visitors and attracting skills and talent to Auckland.

Being ‘film-friendly’ while balancing the impact on residents and businesses
Many filming projects, particularly television commercials and some television programmes, operate under tight timeframes and require quick decision-making.
Cities that are able to process requests quickly are more attractive to screen production companies, who may only have a very limited amount of time to turn a script into a finished product.

However, filming is a highly controlled activity that relies on the use of public space and there is a need to ensure that local residents, and businesses and the environment are not overly negatively impacted by filming.

Objectives

The overall objective of this document is to:

1. create a film-friendly culture within Auckland Council, Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) and the Auckland Region in order to attract and retain screen production industry business.

Key to this objective being realised is a two way commitment from the wider council organisation and filmmakers to open minded and thorough communication with each other, and an awareness of the needs of local residents and businesses. With this in mind, the other objectives of this document are to:

2. deliver a cohesive, efficient and customer driven service that provides certainty to filmmakers in a globally competitive market.

3. enable public goodwill towards the film industry by making explicit the required conduct of film crews when filming in public spaces, or anywhere that members of the public, local businesses, iwi or the environment are likely to be impacted on.

Screen Auckland is the film office for the Auckland Region and is responsible for the permitting of filming on public open space in the Auckland Region. To enable the achievement of these objectives - contributing to an Auckland which is prosperous with many opportunities and to a sustainable screen industry - Screen Auckland’s strategic priorities are set out in the diagram below.

1 Auckland Council refers to the elected governing body, elected local boards and staff of the council organisation.

2 The term “wider council organisation” refers to Auckland Council and all Council Controlled Organisations and subsidiary companies.
Structure of this document

This document is structured into four distinct parts.

**Section one** - outlines commitments made by Auckland Council and members of the wider council organisation on how they will support the work of the film industry.

**Section two** - provides a quick reference guide for filmmakers on processes and costs related to filming in Auckland.

**Section three** - outlines a code of conduct for filmmakers when filming on public space, or anywhere where members of the public or local businesses are likely to be impacted on. The code of conduct consists of rules filmmakers must abide by when undertaking filming in Auckland, and also provides suggestions on how production companies can go the extra mile when working with local communities.

**Section four** - provides further detail on the approval processes associated with filming as they relate to the different functions of the wider council organisation.

**Attention film makers**

This document is designed for filmmakers considering filming in Auckland. It signifies Auckland Council’s commitment to the screen production industry, and outlines what filmmakers can expect, and what is expected of them, when filming in, on or around public places in Auckland.

Other parties who may find this document of interest include:

- elected members of the governing body and local boards;
- staff within the wider council organisation who are unfamiliar with Auckland’s film friendly commitments, protocols and guidelines;
- residents, businesses or community organisations who would like information on best practice and filming processes in Auckland or are impacted on by filming;
- Mana Whenua;
- other local authorities or film offices.
1 Section One: Core commitments

Our commitment to the screen industry

1.1 Auckland Council and members of the wider council organisation will say yes to the screen production industry unless there are good reasons not to.

1.2 In instances where there are difficulties with a proposed shoot, Auckland Council will listen to and consider all possibilities for mitigation put forward by the screen production industry and others.

1.3 In instances where it is not possible to say yes, this decision will be made promptly and transparently, and Screen Auckland along with relevant members of the wider council organisation will work with the screen production industry to identify alternative options.

1.4 Screen Auckland, with support from relevant officers within the wider council organisation, will make it as easy as possible for the screen production industry to submit a thorough and complete application form. This will reduce the likelihood of delays due to the need to obtain more information later in the process, and unanticipated complications with the filming activity.

1.5 Screen Auckland’s objective is to deliver a customer-driven and efficient service to the screen industry. To achieve this Screen Auckland will constantly seek to identify opportunities to improve the service given to the screen industry, and will work with members of the wider council organisation to achieve this.

Our commitment to Auckland

1.6 Screen Auckland will consider the potential positive and negative impacts of filming on Auckland’s communities and environment and the needs of all impacted communities, partners and stakeholders when facilitating filming applications.

1.7 Screen Auckland, with support from relevant officers within the wider council organisation and local boards, will work with the screen production industry on an ongoing basis to mitigate any negative effects caused by filming and capitalise on opportunities for filming to contribute to Auckland’s social, economic and environmental outcomes.

1.8 Auckland Council and members of the wider council organisation have a cooperative partnership with mana whenua and ensure the screen production industry will follow cultural practices in areas of cultural significance, and protect and use sensitive information as communicated.
Our commitment to fostering collaborative working relationships

1.9 Successful filmmaking and realising the potential benefits of filming for Auckland requires effective collaboration - between the screen industry, Auckland Council and members of the wider council organisation, the local community, local businesses, and stakeholders. Screen Auckland undertakes to:

- foster cooperative and collaborative relationships between all parties;
- build awareness and foster mutual understanding between the respective parties.

Our expectations of the screen industry

1.10 Auckland Council’s support of the screen production industry is based on the expectation that:

- Screen Auckland have received all relevant information concerning proposed shoots;
- the screen industry will maintain their side of the relationship by filming responsibly, within the limits of their film permit, and pursuant to this document.

Should a production company fail to do so, the film permit will become null and void in relation to that particular film shoot.
2 Section Two: A quick reference guide to filming in Auckland

The purpose of this section is to provide filmmakers with a quick overview of the processes and costs associated with filming in public spaces in the Auckland Region. Further detail relating to potential approval requirements can be found in Section Four of this document.

2.1 Obtaining consent to film

If you are filming in, on, or around public open space, public transport or roads you:

- are likely to need a film permit and / or a parking permit;
- will need a copy of the Auckland Film Protocol, and;
- need to be aware of your requirements as outlined in the Auckland Film Protocol.

Once granted, a film permit gives production companies limited permission to occupy and use public open space and must ensure that the public are not overly inconvenienced.

Screen Auckland should be the first port of call for production companies seeking to film in Auckland. They act as a one stop shop for all filming enquiries, by seeking the necessary approvals on your behalf and acting as a “go between” for production companies and the required authorities. Screen Auckland will work to make sure that the film permit application process is as streamlined as possible.

Film permits are issued pursuant to Auckland’s plans, policies and bylaws and pending approval of relevant owners, managers and / or leaseholders of the proposed location such as Auckland Council, local boards, council controlled organisations and iwi. For example, all filming activities within the road corridor or public transport facilities require formal approval from Auckland Transport, a council controlled organisation of Auckland Council. In some areas there are other plans and rules in place that need to be considered. In the Wātakere Ranges Heritage Area, the Wātakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 (WRHAA) will need to be taken into account when planning for and undertaking filming.

If you are filming on private property, you may still require parking permits for vehicles on the street or have other regulatory requirements that need to be met. The combination of the planned filming and the proposed location will determine what approvals are needed and the time it will take to obtain these.

Auckland’s volcanic cones (tūpuna maunga) come under the administration of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority (Tūpuna Maunga Authority). The Authority is independent of Auckland Council. A permit is required for any filming or commercial still photography on the maunga regardless of its nature or scale.

To ensure there is sufficient time for your application to film to be assessed by the Tūpuna Maunga Authority, contact Screen Auckland to discuss your project.
Screen Auckland provides the following facilitation services:

- issues film permits on behalf of Auckland Council once necessary approvals have been received;
- a coordinating role by acting on behalf of production companies to gain the necessary approvals and / or information from relevant members of the wider council organisation (including local boards) and impacted stakeholders;
- information and assistance relating to filming in Auckland;
- booking of locations and outdoor venues;
- quick turnaround for approvals;
- an advocacy service for the screen production industry;
- contacts and liaison with a range of services.

Before submitting an application, call the Screen Auckland film facilitation team to discuss your plans, our contact details can be found at www.aucklandnz.com/film. For larger or more complex shoots, it is often useful to have a pre-application meeting, **early on in the process**, to assess timeframes, likely regulatory requirements and the early identification of any potential problems.
2.2 Flowchart summarising the filming application process

1. Initial Enquiry
- Contact Screen Auckland – a Film Facilitator (FF) will assess the feasibility based on possible locations, dates and description of action.
- During pre-production or early feasibility stages, large or complex productions should arrange a meeting with Screen Auckland to discuss requirements.
- FF liaises with relevant council officers and authorities and advises of any known or foreseeable concerns.

2. Application
- A location manager or other relevant production staff applies to Screen Auckland for a permit to film and is required to complete an application form which can be found at [www.aucklandnz.com/screen](http://www.aucklandnz.com/screen).
- Once the application form is completed and submitted along with the required supporting documentation, a FF acknowledges receipt of application within one working day and provides an early estimate of timeframes.
- FF to advise if any site or planning meetings need to take place prior to a decision being made.

3. Processing Applications
- FF issues the Initial Activity Proposal document, summarising the information supplied by the filmmaker to the appropriate council departments, local boards and external stakeholders for consideration.
- Relevant authorities and interested parties provide feedback / comments to FF.
- FF gives a cost estimate of additional services to the filmmakers and advises if a bond is required.
- FF liaises with filmmakers if it is envisaged that conditions need to be imposed on the film permit or amendments made to filming proposal.
- FF to advise filmmaker of outcome as soon as possible to allow time for mitigation or possible changes to proposed filming.

4. Issuing Permits
- FF advises filmmaker of approval as soon as possible and will supply written confirmation via email.
- Permit contains terms and conditions of approval such as filming dates and activities, approved parking arrangement and traffic management plans, and consultation requirements.

5. Shoot Day and Debrief
- The FF or council officers may undertake a site inspection.
- Location manager or production manager to have a copy of the permit to film and Auckland Film Protocol on site.
- Production to report a debrief of the shoot, including public reaction or if any damage of the location has occurred.
- The filmmaker, in consultation with FF, performs site remediation if required.
- If a portion of the bond is to be retained to repair damage the FF must advise the filmmakers of the reasons.
- If a bond was supplied and there is no damage, the FF must refund the bond.
2.3 Frequently Asked Questions

How do I get a permit to film?

You can find an application for a permit to film on the Screen Auckland website, [www.aucklandnz.com/screen](http://www.aucklandnz.com/screen), or you can contact the Screen Auckland office to speak to a film facilitator first. You can also find a copy of the film permit application in Appendix one.

How long does it take to receive a permit?

Many film shoots can receive a permit within 3-5 working days from receipt of a complete application, depending on the impact and sensitivity of the location. Major impact filming can take significantly longer and so can getting permission to film in sensitive places or areas of public space that are run privately or through trusts.

Why are the time frames for filming so short?

Filming activities are often fast turnaround from concept to delivery. To keep filming in Auckland, in a competitive international market, film crews often have to work within short timeframes.

For very high impact shoots, such as those that require resource consents or road closures, timeframes are necessarily impacted on due to regulatory requirements. These are discussed in more detail in section 4 of this document.

What is public open space?

Any road, footpath, public square, grass verge, berm, public garden, reserve, park, beach, wharf, breakwater, ramp or pontoon, foreshore, dunes, access way, recreational ground or sports field that is owned or operated by Auckland Council.

What is Screen Auckland?

Screen Auckland is part of Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development Limited (ATEED), which is a (Council Controlled Organisation) CCO of Auckland Council. Screen Auckland have delegated authority to issue permits to film on public open spaces throughout the Auckland Region once necessary approvals have been gained from relevant owners, managers and / or leaseholders of the proposed location. Screen Auckland is also an advocate for filming in Auckland and promotes the region as a filming location to the international market.

If I’m filming on private property do I need to tell Screen Auckland?

Yes we want to hear from you. As an advocate for the local film industry we need to ensure that impacts on communities are managed appropriately, and we can also let you know of other activity in the area that may affect your shoot; see section 3.5 for more information. Please note, if you require parking for technical vehicles a parking permit may be required.
Do the standard conditions for filming in Auckland apply to me if my shoot is low impact and doesn’t require a film permit?

Yes, if you are filming in public open space you must comply with the standard conditions for filming in Auckland, even if your shoot is low impact and does not need a permit or has been granted a fee discount or waiver. These conditions help to limit inconvenience to neighbouring businesses and residents; helping to ensure the sustainability of filming in public spaces. See section 3, Screen Industry Code of Conduct, for more information.

I’m undertaking a recce, does the Auckland Film Protocol apply to me?

If you are undertaking a recce to assess the suitability of a location you must ensure that any activity associated with the recce is low impact. You must also ensure that you comply with Section three: Screen Industry Code of Conduct of the Auckland Film Protocol.

I’m planning a shoot for a school or university project, do I need to contact Screen Auckland?

Yes, if you are planning to film in a public place it’s always best to give us a call beforehand to double check. If your equipment is hand-held only, the crew is small (fewer than nine) and you won’t impede public access, at many locations you may not need a film permit. You will still need to comply with the Screen Industry Code of Conduct; see section 3 for more information.

What happens if I film without a permit or are in breach of permit conditions?

Filming in public places in Auckland is controlled under the Auckland Council Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw. The size, impact and location of your shoot determines whether you need a permit to film, as set out in section 2.4 of this document. If a production is filming without a permit when it should have one, or is in breach of its permit, the shoot will be shut down and the production could be blacklisted from future filming in public spaces. The production could be charged a location fee after the shoot takes place, and may not be covered by any insurance that they have. In some cases Auckland Council may also use its powers under the Local Government Act 2002 to seize equipment or fine production companies for breaching permits, for more information see section 3.2 of this document.

If you are planning to film in a public place, contact Screen Auckland to discuss whether you require a permit.

When do I need a traffic management plan for filming?

A traffic management plan (TMP) is needed for any activity that inhibits the regular flow of traffic or involves filming within the road reserve. Your TMP must be drawn up by a certified traffic management company and approved by the Road Controlling Authority. Filming on footpaths and berms does not always need a TMP, this will depend on how filming impacts on safety and public access. Contact Screen Auckland for advice. If you are filming with a vehicle or wish to rig equipment to a
vehicle speak to a film facilitator who will be able to advise you of the best way to manage your shoot safely.

**Why do I have to engage in consultation?**

Filming can impact the day to day activities of businesses and residents and because public open space is for everyone, we need to ensure that you have properly informed those who may be affected.

It is in the interests of all parties that businesses and residents are treated with respect in order to ensure that filming in public spaces is sustainable for future shoots.

**What if my shoot involves animals?**

Production companies wishing to film animals in public places must comply with the Animal Management Act 1999 and need to be aware of the:

- Dog Management Bylaw which sets out rules around dogs in public places. For example, filming a dog off leash in some areas will require special permission or a temporary change to the bylaw, which can take time.
- Animal Management Bylaw which sets out rules around other animals in public place.

More information on bylaws can be found in section 3.3 of this document or on Auckland Council’s website.

**How do I pay for my filming?**

You will receive an invoice which can be paid via bank transfer. You will be notified if payment is to be made elsewhere.

**How do I get a fee reduction?**

Fees are assessed on a case-by-case basis. Talk to your film facilitator if your project is not-for-profit, or if it is charity or community based.

**Can I remove street furniture for my shoot?**

The removal of street furniture, including signs and the adjustment of street lighting, is permissible on a case-by-case basis. Any arrangement for this work must be made through Screen Auckland and all costs, including damage or reinstatement costs, have to be met by the production company.

**How come someone else filmed here and I can’t?**

Shoots are assessed on a case-by-case basis and Auckland is a living, breathing, changing environment. Many factors come into play when assessing feasibility of a location; these include impact, time of day, day of week, frequency of other activities in the area, civil works or other filming activity already taking place in the area.

**What if my shoot involves stunts, firearms or special effects?**

You are likely to be subject to additional levels of scrutiny, as described in section 4.9 of this document. You must ensure these risks are described and planned for in your application and safety documentation for the shoot. Note, filming involving stunts,

---

2 Go to [www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) click on “Plans, policies bylaws reports and projects”, click on “Our bylaws” then click on “Current bylaws”
firearms or fireworks are not likely to be approved for applications to film on the tūpuna maunga.

**What are the boundaries of the Auckland Region?**

The Auckland Region spans from Wellsford in the north to Pukekohe in the south. For a map of the Auckland Region go to the Auckland Council website [www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz), click on “GeoMaps (GIS viewer)” in the “get it done online section”.

**Why have the production chosen a particular location?**

There are many variables as to why a location has been chosen. Briefs can be very specific and the requirements for the location have to balance the creative needs of the brief and the logistics of getting crew and equipment into the location.

Sometimes we deliver to an international market which requires specific looks to be believable for the viewer. For example, High St has a universal look that translates to a European/British/period cityscape. Bethells Beach has a unique look that cannot be found anywhere else in the world.

**What if my shoot involves a drone?**

If you plan to use a drone for commercial or organised filming in a public space you will need a film permit, even if you believe you are a low impact crew. If your shoot is going to make use of a camera on a drone alongside your other filming, make sure planned drone operations are included in your planning and application.

Depending on your location there may be additional requirements to work through to manage the use of the drone, which may include a requirement to use a spotter, traffic management plans and/or in some areas the drone operator will/may be required to have part 102 certification from the Civil Aviation Authority. In some locations the use of a drone may need to consider and manage the potential impact of drones on native species such as birds.

To get a permit to film using a drone, your public liability certificate must show that you have insurance for the use of a drone – this means you need aviation cover.

**What should I do if I have an enquiry about filming in my neighbourhood?**

If you have an enquiry about any aspect of filming activity in your neighbourhood please contact the Auckland Council Call Centre on 09 301 0101 – and ask to speak to a film facilitator or send an email to [screen@aucklandnz.com](mailto:screen@aucklandnz.com) and one of our film facilitators will get back to you.
2.4 Filming impacts and Auckland Council requirements

Table one provides an overall indication of council requirements as they relate to the scale of production. However, as each film shoot is assessed on a case-by-case basis, and acknowledging that what may be considered medium impact in one location could be deemed high impact in another; Table one should be read as a guide only.

All productions filming in public open space must comply with Section three: Screen Industry Code of Conduct, even if they are low impact and do not need a permit, or have been granted a fee waiver or are undertaking a recce.

Determination of impact is based on the total impact that the proposed shoots will have on a place and on public access to a place, which can differ based on the location chosen. The types of factors considered when determining impact include, but are not exclusive to:

- the number of people involved in the shoot;
- the location, including (but not exclusive to) whether it is an operational site, a sensitive natural environment, a site of significance to mana whenua, is on or near a heritage place, access to the site is difficult or the site is subject to specific controls in Auckland Council plans, policies or bylaws, the cumulative impact of filming on the site;
- time on site;
- the type of equipment and props being used on site (note any commercial or organised filming using a drone will require a permit to film);
- access requirements, impact on public access to the location and impacts on service levels for users (such as the length of time and extent to which public facilities are closed);
- vehicles associated with filming.
Table 1. Filming impacts - read as a guide only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low impact</th>
<th>Medium impact</th>
<th>High impact</th>
<th>Major impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit may be required</td>
<td>Permit required</td>
<td>Permit required – other consents may be required</td>
<td>Permit required – other consents may be required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people on site</td>
<td>Up to 9 crew/talent. Online, photography, News crew and documentary</td>
<td>Up to 30 crew and 20 talent.</td>
<td>Up to 50 crew 100 talent.</td>
<td>50+ crew and 100+ talent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of equipment vehicles</td>
<td>No trucks. Vans, utes, cars only.</td>
<td>No more than 6 trucks.</td>
<td>No more than 12 trucks.</td>
<td>12+ trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(trucks, vans, utes, cars)</td>
<td>No unit base/catering area required. No structures.</td>
<td>Small unit base/catering area required. Minimal structures, e.g. ezi-ups.</td>
<td>Unit base/catering area required. Some structures including ezi-ups and mega decks.</td>
<td>Large unit base/catering area required. Significant structures and construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit base/ catering &amp; Structural requirements</td>
<td>Handheld camera and sound equipment. 1 camera on tripod. 1 Battery operated light. No generator.</td>
<td>Minimal equipment, e.g. camera tracks, slider and lights on stands.</td>
<td>Equipment used, e.g. camera tracks, dollies, lights on stands, camera cranes</td>
<td>Extensive equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment requirements</td>
<td>No filming on roads or traffic management. Footpaths and public walkways unblocked.</td>
<td>Minimal traffic management required/Minor roads.</td>
<td>Traffic management required, including LV road closures.</td>
<td>Significant traffic management required/multiple roads or main roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic management (footpaths and roads)</td>
<td>No disruption is caused to council stakeholders, businesses, residents, motorists or other events in the vicinity. Immediate area consultation may be required.</td>
<td>May be some minor disruption to council stakeholders, businesses, residents, motorists or other events in the vicinity. Local area letter drop.</td>
<td>Likely to be some disruption to council stakeholders, businesses, residents, or motorists. Local area letter drop. Some individual consultation.</td>
<td>Likely to be significant disruption to council stakeholders, businesses, residents or motorists. Significant letter drop area and local consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the public and communities of interest and consultation requirements</td>
<td>Assessment of the potential positive and negative impacts of filming on the environment and native species of flora and fauna will be determined depending on the location and a range of factors including, but not limited to, time of year, potential for cumulative effects, nature and scale of the proposed filming activity, time on site, the type of equipment and props being used and ability to mitigate and or manage any effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 The guidelines set out in Table 1 do not apply to the Ōpuna Maunga Authority; separate guidance will be given to applicants upon inquiring about filming on Ōpuna maunga.

5 For the purpose of this Table trucks are defined as 3 tonne or over.

6 Communities of interest include but is not exclusive to, local residents and businesses, visitors and regular users of public open space and or community facilities such as sporting, recreational and community organisations.
2.5 Filming fees and associated costs

The table below outlines the fees required for filming in public space managed by Auckland Council. Fees may be waived or discounts applied to low budget or student films, or for filming carried out for charitable or tourism purposes. Fees and other council charges are also subject to change.

Table 2. Fees for filming in public space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Impact</th>
<th>Medium Impact</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
<th>Major Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $50</td>
<td>$200 - $400</td>
<td>$400 - $800</td>
<td>$800 - $1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fees are shown in NZ$ and Inclusive of 15% GST)

There are likely to be other council charges relating to filming in Auckland's public space. These charges may include, but are not necessarily limited to, costs related to resource consents and building compliance fees, parking permits, road closures and the hire of Council managed facilities. Bonds may also be required to cover any environmental or property damage with the costs dependent on the impact and location of the shoot.

Production companies will also be responsible for any costs associated with public notices, if required, engaging private companies for traffic management, resource consent applications or any other required service.

---

7 The fee structure outlined in Table 2 does not apply to filming on the Tūpuna maunga. The Tūpuna Maunga Authority have their own fee structure and discussion about fees will take place upon inquiry about filming on Tūpuna maunga.
3 Section Three: Screen Industry Code of Conduct

Screen Auckland endorses this Auckland Council screen industry code of conduct. To ensure Auckland is a film friendly city in the long-term, it is essential to manage the impact of filming on our environment, local residents, businesses and commuters. Filming can create vibrancy in communities where locals are informed, engaged and sometimes even involved.

Locals that have had positive experiences of filming are much more likely to welcome screen production companies into their neighbourhood in the future. Conversely, a negative experience of filming can make it very difficult for production companies to gain the cooperation of locals in the future.

3.1 Standard conditions for filming activity in the Auckland Region

Once granted, a film permit gives screen production companies limited permission to occupy and use public open space. Screen production companies must seek to limit inconvenience to neighbouring businesses and residents to ensure the sustainability of filming in public spaces. Screen Auckland’s permitting process seeks to ensure that this happens through the conditions of the film permit which incorporate standard conditions as outlined below, and any site specific conditions that are developed on a case by case basis.

The location manager, production manager, producer, or organiser, as appropriate, must have a copy of the permit to film on site along with the Auckland Film Protocol and be familiar with the requirements of the protocol.

Outlined below are standard conditions for filming activity in the Auckland Region. Please note that these conditions apply to recce’s as well as film shoots.

An overview of the standard conditions for the use of Auckland Council Parks, Reserves, Squares, Streets or Facilities may also apply and can be found in section 4.3 of this document.

3.1.1 Hours and days of filming

Filming activity that generates any kind of noise or light disturbance will need to comply with the standards set out in the Auckland Unitary Plan or Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan, as discussed in sections 3.1.5 and 4.7.3 of this document. In consideration of affected stakeholders and landholders, the following provisions also relate to the hours and days of filming:

- In City centre retail areas – Where possible, filming to occur in the weekend and ideally before 10am and after 5pm on Saturday or before 11am and after 4pm on Sunday. In the four weeks preceding Christmas, filming will be restricted to before 10am and after 5pm on Saturdays and before 11am and after 4pm on Sundays only. Exceptions may be made for productions that can wait for longer than the standard 3-5 working days for a decision on their application, but this will be determined in consultation with the relevant business association.
- **In retail areas outside of the City centre** – Where possible, filming is to occur outside of business hours OR at traditionally quiet times as determined in consultation agreed with the local business association. Film facilitators can assist in making the appropriate contacts.

- **In all retail areas** – Filming to avoid key retail areas on the week preceding Christmas, and to refrain from filming on Mother’s Day and Father’s Day, as determined in consultation with the local business association or the local board should no local business association exist.

- **In all business areas** – Where possible, filming to avoid times of high pedestrian and commuter traffic i.e. the beginning and end of the working day. These times may vary depending on the nature of the local business.

- **In high use parks and reserves** – Filming is typically restricted to weekdays, apart from quiet times of the year as agreed with Community facilities and in consultation with the parks department. Filming in high use parks and reserves may be restricted during periods of high demand such as school holidays and public holidays.

- **In residential areas and places of accommodation businesses** – Filming activity that generates any kind of lighting or noise disturbance must comply with noise and lighting standards set out in the Auckland Unitary Plan or Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan and should:
  - set up no earlier than 6.00am Monday to Saturday on a weekday and 8.00am on a Sunday the weekend;
  - commence no earlier than 7.00am Monday to Saturday and 9.00am on the weekend;
  - finish no later than 10.00pm Monday to Saturday on a weekday or 116.00pm on the weekend.

- **Night shoots** – If you are planning a night shoot, please contact Screen Auckland to discuss options such as pre-setting, appropriate locations and approvals.

3.1.2 Parking and loading

Unless expressly permitted otherwise, parking and loading arrangements for filming are as follows:

- **Minimise on street parking** – On street parking should be minimised as much as possible and access maintained for crucial residential and business deliveries. Screen Auckland will assess approve the final numbers on a case by case basis.

- **Essential vehicles** – Essential vehicles (i.e. equipment and/or large vehicles) to be parked legally and with the relevant permits. Where possible, essential vehicles to be parked in front of buildings that are either vacant or closed during the hours of filming activity.

- **Crew and cast vehicles** – Crew and cast vehicles and other non-essential vehicles are prohibited from car park spaces required for retail customers or users of other neighbouring facilities such as community centres, libraries, sports facilities, schools etc.

- **All vehicles to be parked legally** – All vehicles associated with the filming activity must be parked legally e.g. facing the correct way, not on yellow lines etc.

- **Maintaining access to loading zones** – Access to loading zones for the purposes of servicing and delivering goods to and from local businesses must be maintained.

---

8 Unless expressly permitted otherwise refers to express permissions granted by affected stakeholders. Just who those stakeholders are depends on the location and impacts of the film shoot. Screen Auckland can advise.
- **Use of loading zones** – During restricted times, production companies to use loading zones for the purposes of delivering or collecting goods for no longer than the times specified on signage (generally no longer than 5 minutes).

Production companies seeking to reserve specific parking areas for essential vehicles are likely to require film parking permits, see sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 for further information.

### 3.1.3 Public pedestrian access

Unless expressly permitted otherwise, pedestrian arrangements for filming are required as follows:

- **Use of location / production assistants** – Location Assistants to be used to keep the public informed of the filming activity and escort them through the filming area.

- **Maintenance of pedestrian passage** – Pedestrian passage to be maintained through the public space the filming activity is occurring on and crew and cast to keep a low profile. On occasion productions can ask pedestrians to hold from walking through a shot for a maximum of two – five minutes depending on the location and the accessibility to alternative routes. Locations with high pedestrian traffic are likely to be restricted.

- **Modification of pedestrian passage** – Minor modifications to pedestrian passage to be developed in conjunction with Screen Auckland and affected stakeholders if required. In the case of a footpath closure or detour route, a TMP drawn up by a certified traffic management company must be supplied.

- **Access to doorways** – Unrestricted access to doorways to be maintained.

- **Wheelchair access** – The filming activity allows for the needs of wheelchair users to move through the public space and/or safely access an appropriate detour.

### 3.1.4 Filming activity on roads

Any filming-related activity that changes or is likely to change the normal use of a road will require a TMP which must be drawn up by a certified traffic management company and must be approved by Auckland Transport. A TMP must ensure the following:

- **Traffic Impacts** – The operation and safety of the transport network is maintained.

- **Maintaining vehicle access** – Access to residences, businesses and recreational areas are maintained.

- **Business deliveries and servicing** – Crucial deliveries and business servicing can occur.

- **Filming on Auckland’s cycle-ways** may not require a TMP, but specific health and safety precautions will be required.

### 3.1.5 Noise and lighting

The Auckland Unitary Plan and the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan include noise and lighting provisions designed to manage their effects. Noise and lighting should be kept to a minimum before 7am and after 10pm Monday to Saturday and before 9am and after 6pm on a Sunday. Production companies must comply with Auckland Unitary Plan noise levels and with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991.

In some locations production companies will also need to consider the impact that noise and lighting may have on wildlife such as native birds and in some locations...
may be required to comply with dark sky lighting standards. Screen Auckland will inform production companies early on in the process if this is likely to be a requirement of their desired location and:

- will work with the production company and appropriate stakeholders to plan for and manage these effects;
- or to identify an alternative location if the effects cannot be appropriately managed.

Production companies are also required to use blimped generators in locations when noise is likely to impact on adjacent parties e.g. cafes with outdoor seating. Screen Auckland will be able to advise.

### 3.1.6 Health and safety responsibilities

Health and Safety in New Zealand workplaces is regulated by the Health & Safety at Work Act 2015, which promotes health and safety management in the workplace and focuses on the prevention of harm to employees at work.

Film crews must comply with:

- the requirements of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015
- the ScreenSafe Health and Safety Guidelines
- guidance on best-practice processes for the engagement of crew in the New Zealand screen production industry as outlined in the 2017 Blue Book
- any specific health and safety requirements or instructions set out in, or issued in conjunction with, your film permit.

It is the responsibility of production companies to ensure that public safety is not compromised as a result of their filming activity. As part of your application for a film permit you will be required to provide a site specific Health and Safety Plan, see section 4.6.1 for more information.

### 3.1.7 Removal of rubbish and returning a site to its original condition

It is the responsibility of production companies to ensure that any area associated with the filming activity is returned to its original condition, including the removal of all signs and waste. The removal and disposal of all rubbish must take place immediately after the filming activity.

Auckland has set a goal of being zero waste by 2040 and we expect film crews to play their part by minimising waste and using zero waste practices. It is encouraged that all filming activities provide the necessary waste facilities for separation of waste streams (organic, recyclables, landfill and paper/card); with clear and appropriate signage and that relevant service providers are used to ensure maximum diversion of waste from landfill. To minimise waste accumulation, consider the productions procurement for example, avoiding single serve items when catering (such as plates and cutlery). More detail can be found in section 3.9 of this document. Where electrical or hazardous materials are used, these items are to be disposed of responsibly through facilities that divert waste streams from landfill. Depending on

---
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your film proposal you may be required to provide a waste management plan. This plan is designed to help identify expected waste streams and how to reduce them.

For more information on how to dispose of a range of items and materials responsibly please use Auckland Council’s online Recycling Search Tool11.

3.1.8 Communication and consultation
Production companies carrying out filming activity must communicate with residents, businesses and any other parties affected by the activity. What this communication involves depends on the scale and location of the filming activity as outlined below:

- **Minimum requirements** – As a minimum requirement, production companies should deliver a flyer to each residence or business in the affected area. The flyer should contain the following information and be approved by a Screen Auckland Film Facilitator prior to its distribution:
  - the name of the activity;
  - the name of the organiser;
  - the general nature of the activity;
  - the duration of the activity including set up and pack down periods;
  - the location managers contact details before and on the day of the event - including mobile phone numbers;
  - Auckland Council’s contact centre phone number: 09 301 0101;
  - in some cases a parking plan or site map might be required.

- **Notice required for medium impact shoots** – Medium impact film shoots must give affected residents at least 48 hours’ notice and businesses at least two working days.

- **Notice required for high to major impact shoots** – High and major impact film shoots must give affected residents at least 48 hours’ notice, unless access to their properties will be affected in which case 5 days is required. Affected businesses require 5 working days’ notice and their feedback must be sought.

- **Road closures** – There is a legislative process that needs to be followed for a road closure which involves two public notices, as discussed in section 4.1.2 of this document, in printed news media to inform the public about the road closure. This needs to be actioned at least 12 working days before the proposed date of the road closure, and the production company are responsible for notifying affected businesses and residents at this time also. Longer lead times are recommended for traditionally busy periods such as Easter, Anzac Day and Christmas. Information about planned road closures is also available on Auckland Transport’s website https://at.govt.nz/road-works-disruptions.

- **In City centre retail areas** – Face to face consultation with businesses is required for medium to major impact filming in City centre retail areas. This must be carried out at least 5 working days prior to the filming activity and involve delivering flyers to the business in person, recording the name of individuals and businesses consulted with, and recording their initial feedback. Productions are requested to incorporate feedback from businesses wherever possible, and supply this to Screen Auckland.

---

11 Go to https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz click on "rubbish and recycling", then click on "how to get rid of unwanted items"
3.2 Compliance with relevant plans, policies, bylaws, and rules

Production companies must comply with Auckland Council. There are a number of plans, policies, bylaws, and rules in relation to conduct in public open space that production companies, like everybody else, are required to adhere to. These include, but are not limited to, alcohol bans, animal control, vehicles on beaches, signage rules and smokefree areas.

Maintaining responsible and positive behaviour when filming in public open space is important to ensure ongoing access to these locations.

Production companies planning to use signage, including directional signage such as location arrows, should also make themselves aware of the Signage Bylaw in place throughout the region, and any relevant Unitary Plan rules relating to signage. Up-to-date information concerning council plans, policies and bylaws can be found on Auckland Council’s website\(^{12}\) and on the Auckland Transport website\(^{13}\), or Screen Auckland can advise.

3.3 Compliance with the Auckland Film Protocol and film permit conditions

Full compliance with the Auckland Film Protocol and the conditions of the film permit is expected. If a production company fails to comply with Auckland Council policy, plans or bylaws, with the Auckland Film Protocol or the conditions of a film permit:

- the shoot will be shut down and the production could be blacklisted from future filming in public spaces in Auckland for a period of up to three months;
- the production company could be charged a location fee after the shoot takes place;
- the production may not be covered by any insurance that they have;
- equipment could be seized\(^{14}\);
- the production company could be fined up to $20,000\(^{15}\).

Production companies must ensure that they understand permit conditions and that all filming activities are conducted in accordance with these conditions.

Auckland Council will monitor filming activity at its discretion, particularly for filming in sensitive areas and those considered to have a high or major impact. Production companies must follow any directions given by staff of Auckland Council or staff of the wider council organisation.

3.4 Filming potentially offensive material

The filming of content injurious to the public good may be subject to additional levels of scrutiny to ensure consistency with council’s legal and policy obligations. Production companies filming content for television commercials that may be

\(^{12}\) Go to [www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) click on “Plans, policies bylaws, reports and projects”

\(^{13}\) Go to [www.at.govt.nz](http://www.at.govt.nz) click on “about us” then click on “bylaws”

\(^{14}\) Council may seize or impound equipment under section 164 of the Local Government Act 2002

\(^{15}\) Council may prosecute breaches of a film permit under section 242 of the Local Government Act 2002
considered socially or environmentally irresponsible should consult the Advertising Standards Authorities website.\textsuperscript{16}

\section*{3.5 Filming on private premises}
Production companies using private businesses or residences for film shoots should be aware of the Auckland Film Protocol, the requirements of the Auckland Unitary Plan and the need to be respectful of adjacent businesses and residents, particularly with regards to on-street parking, lighting, noise and the use of public open space. When filming on private premises, it is recommended that the production company speaks to Screen Auckland first as they may be aware of activities and issues in the public spaces immediately adjacent to the premises that can assist with the planning of the filming activity.

Other things for production companies to keep in mind:

- that the managing agent or the owner of the premise agrees to the filming;
- the degree to which the premise has been used for filming in the past, the potential impact on neighbours due to the high use of technical vehicles in the vicinity, and how best to mitigate this;
- that all parking requirements are able to be met (remembering that Auckland Transport is the only agency entitled to issue parking permits);
- that electric power can be supplied or there is a possibility of connection to existing networks.

Screen Auckland welcomes discussions with private property owners on how they can work together in the best interests of production companies and local communities.

\section*{3.6 Using local businesses}
Productions are urged to use local businesses for catering and supply. Screen Auckland may be able to assist with making the necessary contacts for the local business association.

\section*{3.7 Smokefree Areas}
In accordance with the Auckland Council Smokefree Policy, many public places in Auckland, including parks and reserves, plazas and squares, public beaches and public transport facilities are designated as smokefree areas. Up-to-date information on which public places are now smokefree can be found on Auckland Council’s website.\textsuperscript{17}

\section*{3.8 Filming in sensitive areas and the management of cumulative effects}
Depending on the impact and the nature of the film shoot, some communities may be particularly sensitive to filming impacts. This could be due to the cumulative effects of

\textsuperscript{16} http://www.asa.co.nz/

\textsuperscript{17} Go to www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz click on “Policies, policies, bylaws, reports and projects” then click on “Our policies” and then click on “Smokefree policy”
frequent filming and/or events in the area, bad experiences with film crews or concerns about a community’s media image and how they have been portrayed in the past. Screen Auckland will inform production companies if this is the case for their desired location as soon as possible, and will work with production companies to identify ways of addressing local concerns or accessing alternative sites.

3.9 Protecting sensitive natural environments

Auckland’s natural environment provides stunning locations and is a key reason for filming here. The many different natural environments across Auckland - our harbours, beaches and islands, our maunga, forests, streams and parks - are places of importance to Aucklanders. It’s important to Aucklanders that Auckland’s natural environment is treated with respect.

The film permit process will need to consider and plan for the potential impact on natural environments. This will take into account a range of factors including, but not limited to, location, the time of year, nature and scale of the proposed filming activity, time on site, the type of equipment and props being used, potential for cumulative effects, and ability to mitigate and or manage any effects.

Some parts of the Auckland Region contain sensitive natural environments which may be more easily damaged by external factors. When filming in sensitive natural environments, such as around sensitive dune systems or wetland areas, it is essential that film crews work in a manner that protects such environments. Screen Auckland will inform production companies early on in the process if their desired location is considered sensitive and will facilitate discussions with appropriate stakeholders and the production company on what can be done to protect these environments. Further information on filming on beaches and in the coastal marine area is provided in section 4.3.6.

3.10 Environmental sustainability

To protect the local environment it is necessary for production companies to minimise the environmental impacts of filming operations and preserve local biodiversity.

Consider how crew and cast can travel to and from the film location and whether public transport, buses/shuttles and or ridesharing can be utilised and promoted. Look for opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by effective fleet management and energy efficient electrical equipment.

One way to minimise your impact on the environment is to reduce the amount of waste produced during filming. Auckland has set a goal of being zero waste by 2040 and we expect film crews to play their part by minimising waste and using zero waste practices. Make decisions about set design, wardrobe and make-up that incorporates a sustainable approach. Look for opportunities to reuse, repurpose or recycle materials, such as props and costumes used during the production. Prevent unnecessary water usage and minimise any noise and air pollution.

Minimise and manage waste to reduce waste to landfill. Look for opportunities to reduce waste from the outset – consider if it is possible to substitute something that
causes waste with something that doesn’t. For example, can single use disposables like plastic water bottles and plastic cups be replaced with reusable alternatives? If not, are there recyclable or compostable options that would avoid items being sent to landfill. Set up waste systems to separate different waste streams (organic, recyclable, landfill, paper and card); to manage and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.

Depending on your film proposal you may be required to prepare a waste management plan. This plan is designed to help identify expected waste streams and how to reduce them. Screen Auckland will be able to provide you with more information.

### 3.11 Protecting Auckland’s historic heritage

When filming on or near historic heritage places, such as an archaeological site or historic building, it is essential that film crews work in a manner that protects these places. Screen Auckland will inform production companies early on if their desired location is on or near a historic heritage place and will facilitate discussions with appropriate stakeholders and the production company on what can be done to protect these places and mitigate any risks to historic heritage.

Consultation with mana whenua and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga may be required.

### 3.12 Protecting our native species

New Zealand’s geographic isolation means we have many unique native plants, birds and animals some of which are classified as endangered species.

Filming in some location will need to consider, plan for and manage the negative effects that filming may have on our native species. Depending on the proposed filming activities, filming may be restricted in some locations at some times of year, such as breeding and nesting periods. Filming in some locations will be subject to conditions to ensure film activity does not negatively impact on native species. Screen Auckland will inform production companies early on in the process if this is likely to be a consideration at their desired location and:

- will work with the production company and appropriate stakeholders to plan for and manage these effects;
- or to identify an alternative location if the effects cannot be appropriately managed.

Introduced weeds, pests and pathogens, like kauri dieback and myrtle rust, pose a threat to our native species. To manage the spread of pests and protect our native species Auckland Council may place additional conditions on film permits, in accordance with the Regional Pest Management Plan or in response to emerging threats. Production companies must comply with any conditions, guidelines, or approved procedures set out in or issued in conjunction with your film permit.
3.13 Going the extra mile
To maintain a sustainable industry, it is important that local residents, communities, iwi and businesses have a positive experience of filming. For example, for businesses this could be increased custom through production companies using their products or services, or promotion of their business in the film shoot or credits. For local residents this could be through giving back to the community by providing entertainment in the local park. Engaging with, local boards, the community and iwi is also a good way to understand the local environment and community dynamics you have chosen to film in and can add value to your filming project.
Some other ideas on how screen production companies could ‘give back’ to communities they are filming in are listed below:

- communities often like to see their local area represented on film. If the film project is something that will be screened in New Zealand, inform local residents and businesses of this and consider ways of letting people know when and where it will be screening. Alternatively, send them a copy of the finished product;
- acknowledging, local boards, local communities and organisations in the credits;
- donate to local schools or community organisations;
- carry out promotional filming for affected areas (for example conservation or heritage areas);
- consider how local iwi can benefit and be recognised such as opportunities to refer to the history of an area, provide employment, use correct Māori names for sites and acknowledge these in the credits;
- invite locals to work as extras;
- consider the possibility of work experience opportunities.

3.14 Insurance requirements
Those undertaking filming activity on Auckland’s open spaces will likely require public liability insurance to cover any damages done to council property, private property or serious accidents caused by the filming activity. If you will be using a drone during filming, your public liability insurance will need to include an aviation clause and you will need to list the pilot and aircraft details. Please contact Screen Auckland for further information.

3.15 Concerns about filming
If you wish to make an enquiry about any aspect of filming activity in your neighbourhood please contact the Auckland Council Call Centre on 09 301 0101 – and ask to speak to a film facilitator or send an email to screen@aucklandnz.com and one of our film facilitators will get back to you.
4 Section Four: The approval process in detail

The fourth section of this document provides further detail on the approval processes associated with filming as they relate to the different functions of the wider council organisation. This includes:

- traffic management;
- parking essential vehicles;
- filming on parks and reserves;
- filming on other properties owned by Auckland Council or Council Controlled Organisations;
- filming on public transport or public transport facilities;
- health and safety considerations;
- heritage considerations;
- resource consent considerations;
- building consent considerations;
- special effects, stunts and firearms.

4.1 Traffic management

Any filming-related activity that changes or is likely to change the normal use of a road will require a TMP to be prepared by a certified traffic management company and approved by the road controlling authority. Depending on the impact filming has on the normal use of the road you may also need to apply for a temporary road closure.

Costs of traffic management planning and implementation, including the cost of public notices, if required, are the responsibility of the production.

In most cases in Auckland the road controlling authority will be Auckland Transport, a council controlled organisation of Auckland Council. Auckland Transport is responsible for all of Auckland’s public roads (except motorways and state highways), footpaths and parking.

4.1.1 Roads controlled by the New Zealand Transport Agency

In some cases the road controlling authority will be the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZ Transport Agency). The NZ Transport Agency is responsible for the management of all motorways, state highways, over-bridges, on-ramps and off-ramps in Auckland. Screen Auckland can assist with identifying the appropriate contacts in the NZ Transport Agency.
4.1.2 Applying for a temporary road closure
If you need to close part or all of a road, you will need to apply for permission from Auckland Transport and there is legal requirement\(^\text{18}\) for two public notices to be placed in printed news media to inform the public about the road closure.

Screen Auckland needs at least 12 working days' notice to book the two required public notices in the printed news media. Longer lead times are recommended for traditionally busy periods such as Easter, Anzac Day and Christmas. At the time of writing, the cost for the two public notices came to approximately NZ$1000. The costs associated with public notices are the responsibility of the production.

4.1.3 Developing a traffic management plan
Auckland Transport can provide guidance as to the level of TMP required for filming in different road environments, however it is the responsibility of the production company to source the necessary assistance to develop one.

Traffic management equipment (cones, barriers, signs etc.) can only be deployed by a suitably qualified person. In most cases this will be a Site Traffic Management Supervisor level 1 (STMS LV 1) or STMS LV2/3 for level 2 roads which carry 10,000 vehicles per day or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Traffic management plan approval timeframes for suburban streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low impact (e.g. footpath closure) Decision reached within 3-5 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium impact (e.g. lane closure) Decision reached within 3-5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High impact (e.g. road closure) Decision reached within 12 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4 Cost of developing a traffic management plan
The cost of developing traffic management plans and their implementation during filming can vary considerably and escalate quickly depending on the complexities of the proposed location and the filming scenario. To ensure a good outcome, anyone considering filming on main roads must establish if the location is feasible in the early stages of location scouting. Contact Screen Auckland for preliminary advice on the proposed location and approach a qualified traffic management provider for an early indication of costs.

\(^{18}\) Under the Local Government Act 1974
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4.2 Parking essential vehicles
A screen production company parking essential vehicles in the street should send a parking plan to Screen Auckland for them to assess and advise on where best to park these vehicles. As part of the assessment, Screen Auckland will consider how much pressure has been placed on parking in the proposed area, and alternatives that may have less impact on any affected businesses or local residents. Parking plans will receive a response within 1-2 working days.

4.2.1 Film parking permits (non-enforceable)
Production companies seeking to reserve specific parking areas for essential vehicles are likely to require film parking permits. These allow permit-holders to park on a defined part of a road when necessary.

Film parking permits allow a production to place cones within the road reserve to temporarily reserve an area prior to vehicles arriving onsite, but do not give permit holders the power to tow other vehicles parked in the permit area. As a courtesy, permit holders should notify businesses and residents in the immediate area via a letter drop or door knocking at least 48 hours in advance. Production companies may also want to consider having a marshal on site to politely advise people of the permitted parking area. Film parking permits take around 2-3 working days to be approved and additional charges for use of parking spaces may apply in some areas.

Please note these permits may not be used for crew or cast vehicles.

Film parking permits are not available for use in loading zones, bus stops or in public time restricted parking areas where parking is restricted to 30 minutes or less.

As the process of reserving parking spaces involves working within the road corridor, it is a health and safety requirement that any staff undertaking this activity have been briefed on the operational requirements of the Screen Auckland Reserved Parking document (SARP) and the applicant has signed the SARP TMP.

Screen Auckland can assist film production companies to apply for film parking permits.

4.2.2 Temporary parking resolutions (enforceable)
Temporary parking resolutions are a short-term legal designation to change existing parking restrictions in a specified area. Temporary parking resolutions should only be considered where the public needs to be excluded from an area for safety or signage reasons or there is genuinely no alternative parking available for essential vehicles.

Timeframes associated with temporary parking resolutions are generally not as favourable as those for film parking permits. Vehicles can legally be towed from the areas designated by temporary parking resolutions, however this should be a last resort as the standard notification procedures of letter drops and door knocking in adjacent buildings should have alerted most people to moving their vehicles.
The Traffic Control Committee has delegation for the approval of parking resolutions. The Traffic Control Committee meets every second Friday to consider applications. Applications must be submitted at least 12 working days before each meeting.  

4.2.3 Parking essential vehicles legally
It is a legal requirement that vehicles are parked facing the right way (i.e. not facing oncoming traffic), and are not parked over driveways, footpaths or berms.

4.3 Filming on parks, reserves and other public open space
Auckland Council manages more than 4000 parks and reserves. These parks vary from small local neighbourhood open spaces and sports parks, to iconic premier parks like Auckland Domain (Pukekawa), and conservation areas such as the Waitematā Ranges. They may be coastal reserves, volcanic cones or homes to popular playgrounds. Information concerning parks and reserves can be found on Auckland Council’s website, and Screen Auckland’s film facilitation team can assist with finding suitable parks, reserves and other public open space (such as squares and plazas) for filming.

Landowner approval is required to film on any park or reserve, and permission will depend on natural, cultural, landscape and recreational values being adequately protected. In the Waitematā Ranges Heritage Area, the WRHA Waitematā Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 will need to be taken into account by landowners when considering filming applications. Production companies granted permission to film in the Waitematā Ranges Heritage Area will need to ensure that filming activities comply with the requirements of the WRHAA. Further information about the WRHAA is included in the Key New Zealand Legislation section of this document. A number of plans exist in relation to public spaces within Auckland, such as the Tūpuna Maunga Integrated Management Plan and park specific management plans like the Auckland Domain Masterplan, and the Tāmaki Drive Masterplan, and these will be taken into account by landowners when considering filming applications. Filming in high use parks and reserves is typically restricted to weekdays, apart from quiet times of year.

Iwi are key landholders of Auckland’s parks and reserves and council recognises that Māori have a special cultural and spiritual relationship with the land.

4.3.1 Filming on Auckland’s tūpuna maunga (volcanic cones)
In July 2014, Government passed legislation to provide Treaty of Waitangi redress for the shared interests of 13 Auckland iwi and hapū in relation to 14 tūpuna maunga (ancestral mountains, also referred to as Auckland’s volcanic cones), motu (islands) and land within Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland).

Auckland’s volcanic cones (tūpuna maunga) come under the administration of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority (Tūpuna Maunga Authority). The Authority is independent of Auckland Council.

---

\[19\] The 12 days allows Auckland Transport staff to draft the appropriate resolutions and place the application on the agenda.
Under the terms of the settlement, the tūpuna maunga are vested in mana whenua, public access is maintained, each maunga will remain a reserve, and the council will continue to be responsible for the routine management of the maunga, under the direction of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority.

The tūpuna maunga sites, and in particular the tihi (summit), are considered tapu (sacred) and regard is given to this when considering applications to film on the tūpuna maunga. All commercial filming on the maunga requires the approval of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority. Screen Auckland facilitates all requests for approval to film on the tūpuna maunga. Each application is assessed on a case-by-case basis in relation to the objectives and policies that apply to the tūpuna maunga and proposed content. Approval to film will be subject to conditions and restrictions set by the Tūpuna Maunga Authority.

Application costs, timeframes, approval processes and location fees for filming on maunga vary depending on the scale and impact of filming. Locations which are in higher demand will be subject to higher location fees. A bond may be required; the bond is fully refundable on confirmation that all conditions associated with the approval have been satisfactorily met.

Screen Auckland can provide further information and advice around requests for approval to film on maunga, including timeframes and fees. To ensure you have sufficient time for your application to film to be assessed by the Tūpuna Maunga Authority, contact Screen Auckland to discuss your project. More information on the Tūpuna Maunga Authority can be found at www.maunga.nz.

4.3.2 Regional parks
There are 27 regional parks in the Auckland Region with beautiful beaches, bush, wildlife and recreational opportunities galore. Responsible filming activity on regional parks is welcome, however due to the unique and sensitive nature of regional parks, contact Screen Auckland’s film facilitation team who can assist with the feasibility of using regional parks for your filming activity.

4.3.3 Parks and reserves not managed by Auckland Council
The Department of Conservation (DOC) are responsible for the management of some parks and reserves, such as Rangitoto Island and Cornwall Park is managed by the Cornwall Park Trust Board. These parties have different processes, fees and requirements. In cases where Screen Auckland does not issue film permits for a particular park, the film facilitation team can assist applicants with making the appropriate contacts within these organisations.

Watercare is a Council Controlled Organisation that provides water and wastewater services to the Auckland Region and is responsible for a number of dams, waterways and treatment plants dotted throughout Auckland’s parks. Screen Auckland will be able to advise if your proposed shoot encroaches on Watercare property. Further

26 For more information about the Tūpuna Maunga Authority, and to read the Tūpuna Maunga Integrated Management Plan, go to www.maunga.nz
information on filming on Watercare property can be found in section 4.4.3 of this
document.

4.3.4 Kauri dieback
Kauri are a native tree and are considered a national treasure; a Jurassic age species
they can grow to more than 50 metres tall and can live for well over a thousand years.

Kauri dieback disease is killing kauri trees in the Auckland Region and threatening
kauri with extinction. The kauri dieback disease is caused by a soilborne pathogen
that is long-lived, invisible to the eye and can be spread by as little as a pinhead of
infected soil or mud being tracked from one area to another. There is currently no cure
for kauri dieback.

If you are granted a permit to film in a regional park where kauri are present your
conditions of consent will require you to follow approved hygiene procedures,
including a requirement to clean gear, tyres and footwear before and after filming on a
reserve or a park. These requirements are to help prevent the spread of the disease.

More information on kauri dieback and on how to avoid spreading the disease can be
found on the Auckland Council website21 or at www.kauridieback.co.nz.

Some areas managed by Auckland Council, including at the time of writing, the
forested area of the Waitākere Ranges and some parts of the Hunua Ranges
Regional Park, have been closed to prevent further spread of kauri dieback and
protect kauri. Up-to-date information on local and regional parks, reserves and public
tracks areas which have been closed can be found on Auckland Council’s website21.

Screen Auckland can also provide you with further guidance about areas which are
closed and will work with production companies to identify an alternative site if your
preferred location has been closed to protect kauri.

4.3.5 Managing the risk of damage to parks
Conditions may be imposed on any parkland use agreement to protect the park
environment, for the health, safety and wellbeing of the visitor, or to facilitate park
operations. In general conditions relate to:

- the location of the activity;
- the duration of the activity;
- the time of day and year the activity may be undertaken;
- the number of people who may participate;
- the use of park facilities and services;
- measures for mitigating adverse effects on the environment, natural and heritage
  resources, existing users and the general public;
- health and safety factors;
- reinstatement requirements;
- measures for monitoring the effects of the activity;

21 Go to http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz then click on "environment", then "plants and animals", then
"pests and weeds", then "protect our kauri trees"
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any modifications / alterations to the proposed activity and associated infrastructure;
the review of the approval and/or any conditions imposed.

Bonds are often required when filming on parks and reserves, and council strongly recommends that production companies have contingency plans as it is possible that a park may become unavailable due to wet ground conditions.

4.3.6 Filming on beaches and in the coastal marine area
Due to the unique and sensitive nature of Auckland’s coastal environment proposals for filming activity on beaches and in the coastal marine area are subject to higher degrees of scrutiny which are likely to impact on filming timeframes.

Any impacts caused by filming on beaches must be adequately mitigated.

All filming activity on the foreshore or on the water is subject to compliance with the Auckland Unitary Plan and the relevant bylaws as discussed in section 3.2 and 4.8 of this document.

Council must also give effect to Policy 20(1) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy statement that relates to vehicles on beaches. This policy states:

(1) Control use of vehicles, apart from emergency vehicles, on beaches, foreshore, seabed and adjacent public land where:

(a) damage to dune or other geological systems and processes; or
(b) harm to ecological systems or to indigenous flora and fauna, for example marine mammal and bird habitats or breeding areas and shellfish beds; or
(c) danger to other beach users; or
(d) disturbance of the peaceful enjoyment of the beach environment; or
(e) damage to historic heritage; or
(f) damage to the habitats of fisheries resources of significance to customary, commercial or recreational users; or
(g) damage to sites of significance to tangata whenua; might result.

Council regulates vehicles on beaches to ensure legitimate and necessary access is identified and protected but unnecessary, damaging and dangerous use is prevented. If you intend to use vehicles on a beach you will need written permission from Auckland Council. If granted permission to use vehicles on a beach, production companies must only use designated access ways to the beach and may not access the foredune area or top of the dune. Successful filming proposals that involve the use of vehicles on beaches will be subject to extra conditions to ensure that:

- where possible the use of vehicles is avoided;
- the number of vehicles allowed under the permit conditions is the minimum necessary;
- vehicle use is highly controlled so as to prevent environmental damage and to protect public safety;
- all additional health and safety obligations are met;

---

22 Auckland Council Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw
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members of the public who are witness to the film shoot are made aware, that a permit is required, of the conditions of the shoot and the controls placed upon it.

Screen Auckland, through regular communication with council’s parks team and with respect to Policy 20(1), can advise which beaches are most suitable to accommodate each filming proposal’s particular requirements.

4.3.7 Filming on the water
The Auckland Harbormaster’s office, a unit of Auckland Transport, is responsible for ensuring maritime safety on all navigable waters within the Auckland Region.

If you plan to film on or in the water, you must inform Screen Auckland. If filming affects the normal operation of other recreational or commercial vessels or water users in an area where you plan to film the Harbormaster will need to be notified and, depending on the level of disruption, the approval of the Harbormaster may be required.

Filming which takes place on navigable waters within Auckland, including rivers, streams, lakes and harbours, must comply with Maritime rules and Auckland Council navigation safety bylaws. If proposed filming does not comply with a navigational bylaw you may apply to the Harbormaster for an uplift of a bylaw or apply to temporarily reserve water space for an activity. Exemptions will be determined on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the effects on navigation safety with respect to the activity.

4.3.8 Filming on other council owned open space
Typical conditions for filming on public open space that are not parks include:

- no vehicles are permitted to drive or park on grass or pedestrian areas without prior written approval from council;
- nothing may be fixed or attached to trees or heritage items without prior written approval from council;
- structures generally need to be freestanding;
- earthworks are not permitted without prior written approval from council;
- all equipment must be stored tidily and cable ramps must be used for pedestrian safety when cables cross footpaths and pedestrian use areas.

4.3.9 Timeframes for filming on parks and other council owned open space
Depending on impact, most applications can be turned around within 3 to 5 working days. This may be slightly longer for film shoots on regional parks or high impact shoots in high use areas. Major impact filming can take significantly longer as it is likely to require pre-application meetings, site visits and extensive consultation. Screen Auckland will be able to advise in the first instance.
4.3.10 Helicopters
If you plan to use a helicopter when filming you will need to obtain permission, except in an emergency, to pick up or drop-off an item or person and to land or take-off from a public place (including parks and beaches\textsuperscript{23}).

You will also need to comply with New Zealand civil aviation rules, the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 and with the Auckland Unitary Plan and Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan. Under some circumstances you may require a resource consent, for example, if you exceed noise levels in the Auckland Unitary Plan when landing or taking-off. Screen Auckland will be able to advise in the first instance.

4.3.11 Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (drones)
If you plan to use a remotely piloted aircraft system (RPAS), also known as, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) or as drones, when filming anywhere in Auckland you must comply with New Zealand civil aviation rules and you must advise Screen Auckland.

New Zealand civil aviation rules require you to obtain the approval of a landowner, including private landowners, to operate a drone over their land. You will need permission to use a drone over public space, maunga, roads or footpaths, or over any property or building owned or managed by Auckland Council or a Council Controlled Organisation, for commercial purposes such as filming. \textit{If you intend to use a drone for commercial or organised filming in a public open space you will need a permit and as part of the permit process Screen Auckland can assist with obtaining landowner permission to use a drone for commercial purposes.}

\textit{Using drones for commercial and organised filming can pose a risk to our native species and other animals and can result in risks to or concern from other users of public open space and neighbouring properties. Production companies must ensure that drones are used safely and must be respectful of wildlife, members of the public, and other users of the open space when using a drone.}

\textit{In some locations and or during some times of year the use of drones may be restricted to avoid harm to native species such as birds.}

\textbf{Please note:} Auckland Council Regional Parks, Auckland Transport and Panuku Development Auckland\textsuperscript{24} only grant permission to film, over or around properties that they manage, for commercial purposes to operators of drones with Part 102 certification from the Civil Aviation Authority. \textit{Part 102 certification may be required in local parks and other areas of public open space.}

Once permission to use a drone for commercial or organised filming in a public open space has been obtained, you must be aware of and must:

\begin{itemize}
  \item comply with all New Zealand civil aviation rules and requirements regarding the use of drones. Further information on New Zealand civil aviation rules can be found at \url{https://www.caa.govt.nz/rpas/}. Note that some areas in Auckland are \textit{controlled}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{23} Auckland Council Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw
\textsuperscript{24} If granted permission to use a drone for filming over a property managed by Panuku Development Auckland you may be required to use an approved drone operator.
airspace” and specific restrictions apply to these areas. For further information on controlled airspace see https://www.airshare.co.nz/maps.

- be courteous to and respect the privacy of other users, comply with Auckland Council bylaws and with any other conditions or guidelines issued by Auckland Council or a Council Controlled Organisation in relation to the use of a drone.

- comply with Auckland Council’s Code of conduct for use of drones and UAVs. The requirements of the Code of conduct include, but are not limited to, drones must not:
  - operate within 20 metres of or be flown over other users of the park;
  - fly over or within 50 metres of livestock on parks, sensitive wildlife habitats such as wetlands, or nesting or roosting birds;
  - fly over adjoining private properties.

A full copy of the Code of conduct for use of drones and UAVs can be found at https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/code-of-conduct-use-drones-uavs.aspx.

Where native birds are present at a film location, permission to film may be subject to additional conditions to ensure the potential impact of drone use is managed and production companies should:
  - abandon contact at the first sign of any bird being disturbed;
  - land drones at a safe distance away if a bird circles or otherwise interacts with a drone in flight;
  - be aware that it is an offence under the Wildlife Act 1953 to disturb or harm protected birds.

4.4 Filming on or in other properties and buildings owned by Auckland Council or Council Controlled Organisations

Auckland Council, either directly or through Council Controlled Organisations, own and/or manage a number of properties and buildings that may at times be of interest to the screen production industry. Properties directly owned and managed by Auckland Council include a number of community centres, halls, swimming pools and libraries.

Other spaces are managed by council controlled organisations, for example spaces such as stadiums, and MOTAT are managed by Regional Facilities Auckland25 while the waterfront and a number of commercial properties are managed by Panuku Development Auckland. These assets are subject to a variety of different governance structures and as such have different processes, timeframes and prices relating to filming. However, as the Auckland Council film protocol is a council-wide protocol, there is an expectation that all areas of the wider council organisation adhere to the film-friendly objectives and core commitments of this document, and will cooperate with filming requests whenever possible.

If you are unsure who manages the property you are interested in filming on, or want to film on properties directly managed by Auckland Council, Screen Auckland’s film facilitation team can assist with applying to film in or on all these facilities.

---

25 For a list of the properties managed by Regional Facilities Auckland - Go to Regional Facilities Auckland’s website http://www.rfa.co.nz click on 'Information, then on 'RFA Facilities'.
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4.4.1 Filming on the city waterfront and other properties managed by Panuku Development Auckland

Much of the land on Auckland’s city based waterfront is owned and managed by Panuku Development Auckland, a council controlled organisation. Panuku Development Auckland welcomes filming and has experience working with Screen Auckland and the screen production industry, however, due to local industry operating in the area, filming may not always be possible on some sites. Screen Auckland will be able to advise in the first instance.

Panuku Development Auckland also manages a range of other properties across Auckland and applications to film on these properties will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Depending on impact, applications for filming on Panuku Development Auckland can usually be turned around in 3 to 5 working days. However, in the case of high impact film shoots, timeframes can be significantly longer.

Additional charges will apply for filming on property that isn’t openly accessible to the public, contact Screen Auckland for further information.

4.4.2 Ports of Auckland

Ports of Auckland are part of a Council Controlled Organisation and own and operate out of a number of sites on Auckland’s waterfront including Princes, Marsden and Captain Cook Wharves.

Ports of Auckland may consider are open to filming requests but there are significant operational and safety issues that need to be considered. Anyone wishing to film should contact the Port to discuss their project at an early stage, and each proposal will be considered on a case by case basis. Charges for filming will vary according to the scale and nature of the project. Further information on application to film is also available on the Ports of Auckland website. An application to film is also available on the Ports of Auckland website.  

4.4.3 Watercare

Watercare is a Council Controlled Organisation that provides water and wastewater services to the Auckland Region, and is responsible for a number of dams, waterways and treatment plants dotted throughout Auckland. Some of these areas are open to the public, and others are subject to high degrees of security.

Watercare are open to filming requests and are committed to a co-operative working relationship with Screen Auckland, but have significant health and safety and liability concerns that need to be satisfied in order for filming to go ahead on their property.

Production companies are encouraged to approach Screen Auckland in the first instance, who may be able to use their experience to assist with making an approach to Watercare that addresses these concerns. In instances where Watercare are unable to accommodate a request for filming, Screen Auckland will work with production companies to identify an alternative site.

---

26 http://poal.co.nz/media/filming-permit
Depending on impact, applications for filming on Watercare property will normally be turned around in 10 working days. In the case of high to major impact film shoots, this can be significantly longer. Charges for filming on Watercare property will be confirmed on application.

4.5 Filming on public transport and public transport facilities

Auckland Transport has experience working with screen production companies and Screen Auckland, and can assist with filming in or on buses, bus stops, trains and train stations. Any filming activity at a public transport facility or on public transport infrastructure such as trains, buses, ferries, rail stations, bus terminals, bus stops and wharves will require formal approval from Auckland Transport. Many Aucklanders rely on public transport to get to and from work and school and to travel around Auckland; making reliable public transport services critical. Normal public transport operations and customer movements should not be interrupted by filming activity.

There are many potential hazards when filming in and around public transport and specific permits are required that identify these health and safety considerations.

4.5.1 Filming on buses

The procedure and timeframes for filming on buses varies depending on type and impact. For media style minor impact filming on scheduled urban services, production companies can contact the media liaison team within Auckland Transport and sometimes approval can be turned around within one working day.

Scheduled filming activity of a low, medium or high impact will need to occur on hired buses and production companies should contact the bus company directly to arrange this; contact details are available on the Auckland Transport website. Unless the filming activity occurring on the bus is carried out entirely on private land, the production company will need to talk to Screen Auckland about film permitting requirements including traffic management. If filming is carried out entirely on public private land, film permits can generally be turned around within 3 to 5 working days. However, screen production companies should give two weeks' notice to allow for liaison between bus operators and Auckland Transport.

Filming activity that will disrupt the public transport network can take up to one month to allow for planning meetings, site visits and passenger communication.

4.5.2 Filming on trains

Screen production companies seeking to film on trains should contact Screen Auckland in the first instance. Screen Auckland will work with Auckland Transport to consider filming requests.

Depending on impact and associated health and safety issues, lead in time for filming on trains can vary dramatically. To film on trains screen production companies will require permits from Auckland Transport and Transdev; for this reason three weeks

---

28 Transdev operates passenger rail services on behalf of Auckland Transport, delivering approximately 3,300 services each week and over 20 million annual passenger journeys.
are required to process applications. Filming proposals that require a large crew or will have a high impact on regular train operations will take longer to process. Screen Auckland will do their best to signal to production companies how long their application will take to process at the outset.

4.5.3 Filming in public transport facilities
Any filming in a bus or train station, ferry terminal or on footpaths in or around bus stops train stations or ferry terminals requires a film permit and will incur costs. In these areas, safety considerations are paramount and production companies can expect conditions that reflect this (such as crew having to wear high visibility vests). You should allow at least 10 working days for your application to be processed.

4.5.4 Costs
Auckland Transport may seek reimbursement for direct costs, related to disruptions to the public transport network and access to public transport facilities. For example, for costs associated with Transport Ambassadors, where major bus stop relocations are required, and security staff.

4.6 Health and safety considerations
Health and Safety in New Zealand workplaces is regulated by the Health & Safety at Work Act 2015, which promotes health and safety management in the workplace and focuses on the prevention of harm to employees at work. The Health and Safety at Work Act applies to international productions while they are working in New Zealand.

Everyone has a role to play in making sure New Zealand workplaces are safe and healthy. Your obligations, under the Health and Safety at Work Act, will depend on your role in the production process, including the amount of control and influence you have over any particular aspect of the project. The more senior your role or the more influence you have, the more responsibility you will have for ensuring the safety of yourself and others.

In addition to the requirements of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, all film crews must comply with the ScreenSafe Health and Safety Guidelines and guidance on best-practice processes for the engagement of crew in the New Zealand screen production industry as outlined in the 2017 Blue Book and Auckland Council bylaws.

You will also be required to comply with any specific health and safety requirements or instructions set out in, or issued in conjunction with, your film permit.

4.6.1 Site specific health and safety plan
As part of your application for a film permit you will be required to provide Screen Auckland with a site specific health and safety plan and general crew safety notes for review. Your site specific health and safety plan should be submitted to Screen Auckland at the same time as your application for a film permit. Where this is not possible you must provide your site specific health and safety plan to Screen Auckland at least 3 working days prior to your intended date of filming. Under some circumstances and only by agreement with Screen Auckland, it may be possible to
submit your site specific health and safety plan to Screen Auckland a minimum of 2 working days prior to your intended date of filming.

The level of site specific health and safety plan required and the timeframe for review will vary depending on your activity proposal and proposed location. Some sites, such as closed landfills which are now used as parks, are considered higher risk than other sites. Higher risk sites may be subject to additional conditions and requirements; for example a site induction may also be necessary and this will require additional time. When developing your site specific health and safety plan, you should consider key risk areas such as cabling, structures, towers, stunts and use of hazardous substances.

To ensure you have sufficient time for your site specific health and safety plan to be reviewed contact Screen Auckland for preliminary advice.

A film permit will not be issued without a reviewed site specific health and safety plan.

4.7 Heritage considerations

Historic heritage reinforces our sense of history, belonging, identity and place. Historic heritage places are likely to have specific restrictions on their use that may impact on timeframes and costs. This will be pointed out by Screen Auckland’s film facilitation team at the point of initial inquiry, and assistance will be given to mitigate effects or locate an alternative site if necessary.

Historic heritage places can include historic buildings, archaeological sites, places of significance to Māori and notable trees. Some historic heritage places are protected by legislation. Some historic heritage places are protected in the Auckland Unitary Plan.

Depending on the nature of the proposal, resource consent may be required for filming on sites protected in the Auckland Unitary Plan. An Authority from Heritage New Zealand may be required for proposals that take place on archaeological sites. Information on places protected in the Auckland Unitary Plan can be found on the Auckland Council website. The types of issues for filmmakers to consider in relation to sites that are significant to Māori include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- the use of indigenous knowledge and any reference to iwi;
- misuse or misappropriation of iwi history, stories or legends;
- inappropriate representation or use of culturally significant images or sites; this can include, but is not limited to, the subject of filming or the depiction of the site (e.g. digitally adapting the appearance of a site in a way that is considered inappropriate).
- use of culturally significant sites including maunga, marae and places included in the Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua schedule in the Auckland Unitary Plan.

---

29 All pre-1900 archaeological sites, recorded and unrecorded, are protected by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.
30 For example in the Historic Heritage Schedule (Schedule 14.1) and the Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Schedule (Schedule 12).
31 Go to www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/heritage
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4.8 Resource consent considerations

Due to the often temporary nature of filming, a resource consent is not usually required to carry out filming within Auckland. However, filming projects involving the long-term use of the same site are much more likely to require a resource consent.

Resource consent criteria are currently determined by the Auckland Unitary Plan and the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan. Go to the Auckland Council website to view the Auckland Unitary Plan and the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan maps and other information\textsuperscript{52}.

Screen Auckland’s film facilitation team can assist with providing contact details for planning staff who have experience working with the screen production industry.

4.8.1 Filming as a temporary activity

The length of time filming can occur without a resource consent currently varies depending on the area. Please see table 5 for a summary. Contact Screen Auckland for further information.

Table 4 Regional variances relating to filming as a temporary activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of the Auckland Region</th>
<th>Length of time filming can occur without a resource consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Region (except the Hauraki Gulf Islands)</td>
<td>Up to, and including, thirty consecutive days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke Island Filming is permitted as a temporary activity in all land units, except landforms 1 (coastal cliffs), 2 (sand flats only) and 4 (wetland systems), island residential 1 and 2 and on any scheduled item(s) and its scheduled site surrounds.</td>
<td>Up to five days, including the time required for establishing and removing all temporary buildings and structures associated with the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Island Filming is permitted as a temporary activity in all land units and settlement areas, except landforms 1 (coastal cliffs), 2 (sand flats only) and 4 (wetland systems) and on any scheduled item(s) and its scheduled site surrounds.</td>
<td>Up to six days. Temporary buildings and structures associated with filming may not occupy the venue for more than 14 days, including the time required for establishing and removing all temporary buildings and structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.2 Filming as a permanent activity

In principle, filming is permitted to take place as a permanent activity within some areas of the Auckland Region. It is important to note however, that this is subject to the ability to meet with a range of other requirements in the Auckland Unitary Plan. If you are considering filming on a semi-permanent or permanent basis from a specific site, please contact council at the earliest opportunity to discuss potential constraints.

\textsuperscript{52} Go to [http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) click on “Plans, polices, bylaws, reports and projects”, then click on either “The Auckland Unitary Plan” or on the “Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan” to read the plans or view the relevant planning maps.
and consent requirements. Screen Auckland can assist with putting you in touch with the appropriate contact.

4.8.3 Possible triggers for resource consents

The following site-related issues are likely to trigger the need for a resource consent:

- excessive lighting;
- excessive noise;
- excessive earthworks;
- removal of protected vegetation;
- close proximity to the coast or other waterbodies;
- close proximity to residential zones;
- inadequate carparking capacity;
- absence of a loading bay;
- the amount of traffic generated;
- heritage related issues;
- hours of operation;
- exceeding the days for a temporary activity or other standards that apply to permitted activities.

4.8.4 Timeframe and cost implications for resource consent applications

If an applicant does require a resource consent to film, council advises that they should engage a planning consultant to assist with their application. Having a pre-application meeting with relevant stakeholders is also strongly advised, as this will greatly increase the likelihood of a thorough application being lodged from the outset and being processed as efficiently as possible. Assuming the application is complete, the council undertakes to assess resource consent applications within 20 working days. Council planners will be able to provide a more specific undertaking of processing timeframes and processing costs at a pre-application meeting or at the time of application, once they have become familiar with the proposal.

If the resource consent needs to be notified, the timeframe increases significantly to 70 or more working days.

Non-notified and relatively simple resource consent applications typically cost $4000 to $6000. Note, resource consent charges include GST and are subject to change. This cost represents the council charges relating to the processing of a resource consent. It does not include charges incurred for the use of external planning consultants by applicants or the payment of development contributions, if these are required. A pre-application meeting is the most efficient way of reducing processing costs. If a resource consent requires notification, this cost can increase significantly.
Visit Auckland Council’s website for application forms and more information on resource consents, including up-to-date information about council charges.

4.9 Building consent considerations

Auckland Council recognises the uniqueness of the screen production industry and its building requirements which frequently have an ill fit with the requirements of the Building Act 2004.

In order to assist the screen industry, Auckland Council may, at its discretion and within its statutory powers as defined in schedule 1, clause (2) of the Building Act 2004, exempt particular temporary film sets from requiring building consents.

4.9.1 Definition of temporary film set

For the purposes of this policy, a ‘temporary film set’ is defined as:

“a building or buildings erected solely to facilitate filming (including but not limited to facades, fences, lean-tos, sheds, cottages, and other similar building work), that are not intended for permanent use or occupation”.

Any person undertaking building works outside the specific “temporary film set” building works defined in this policy must obtain either an exemption from building consent or a full building consent prior to commencing the works.

4.9.2 Temporary film sets in place for ten days or less

Application for an exemption from building consent is not required for the first ten days of a “temporary film set” being in place (including the commencement of the building work and the deconstruction of the set/wrap out), provided they meet the following criteria:

- the building work meets the definition of “temporary film set” and is on private property; or;
- the building work meets the definition of “temporary film set,” is on public open space and less than five metres in height and secure and isolated from the public during this period.

---

33 [http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) - click on "building and consents", then on "The building and consents process", then on "Apply for a consent", then either click on "Apply for a building consent" for further information on building consent fees, or on "Apply for a resource consent" for further information on resource consent fees.
4.9.3 All other temporary film sets
All other "temporary film sets" are required to apply to Auckland Council for an exemption from building consent. Applications for an exemption from building consent will be processed by Auckland Council as a matter of priority within two to three working days providing the engineer involved with the project submits a Producer Statement.

Screen production companies can expect the outcome of the application to be favourable in the case of temporary film sets that meet the following criteria.

- any building work that meets the definition of "temporary film set" and is on private property;
- any building work that meets the definition of "temporary film set," is on public open space, less than five metres in height and secure and isolated from the public.

If Auckland Council refuses to grant an exemption, which will generally be based on the scale and/or permanence of the building work, the applicant will be required to obtain building consent and must not commence works until consent has been granted. Council’s statutory timeframe for processing building consents is 20 working days.

4.9.4 Multiple temporary film sets built in a secure film studio space
Production companies planning on building multiple temporary film sets in a secure film studio space should inform council so discussions can be had on how to provide an efficient service.

4.9.5 Costs
At the time of writing, it costs $453 to apply for a building consent exemption. It costs between $788 and $8348 to apply for a building consent, depending on the value and complexity of the building project. Any further charges are based on an hourly rate of $105 to $198 per hour. Note, building consent fees quoted include GST and are subject to change. Visit Auckland Council’s website for application forms and more information on building consents, including up-to-date information about council charges.

4.9.6 Important notes - Please note:
- For the purposes of this policy, Auckland Council considers that the provisions of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, and the insurance requirements of each individual operator or Film Production Company, are relevant to the extent that they require the company to act lawfully.
- A structural engineering overview for the proposed construction is advisable where the size or complexity of set construction warrants it.
- Film production companies will still need to seek approval from landowners (public or private) to construct film sets on their land. In the case of filming on private property, if an application for an exemption or building consent is required only the landowner or their agent can be the applicant. In the case of filming in public open space within Auckland, this will be managed through Screen Auckland’s film permitting process.
4.10 Planning for additional requirements – The use of special effects, firearms and stunts

Screen production companies intending to use special effects (including weather effects and any type of pyrotechnic) or firearms, or seeking to perform stunts involving vehicles, will be subject to additional levels of scrutiny which has the potential to impact on timeframes. In some instances, further consultation with the fire service and police will be required, as well as a site specific health and safety plan. Screen Auckland will be able to advise in the first instance.

Assessment of permit applications where special effects are planned will also consider the potential impact on the environment and wildlife. This may mean that it is not possible to use special effects in some locations or that usage in some locations may be restricted during certain times of the year.

4.10.1 Pyrotechnics
The New Zealand Fire Service has a number of requirements relating to the use of pyrotechnics and should be contacted by the screen production company as early as possible. Screen Auckland may be able to assist with making the appropriate contact within the fire service.

4.10.2 Weather effects
Wet downs, rain and snow effects may be carried out with the permission of the landowner. Screen Auckland’s film facilitation team can assist you with seeking landowner permission. Where permission is granted to use these types of special effects, they must be undertaken in a safe and ecologically friendly way to ensure that the environment and wildlife are protected from any harmful effects.

When using these types of special effects production companies must:

- avoid sensitive environmental areas;
- use biodegradable non-toxic products, except by agreement with Screen Auckland;
- consider weather and wind conditions when designing and executing these effects;
- ensure the containment, clean-up and removal of all products used for this purpose.

Auckland Council may place additional conditions on film permits where these types of special effects are being used during filming. Screen Auckland can also work with council to facilitate the responsible use of public water for this purpose.

4.10.3 Firearms
The New Zealand Police has a number of requirements relating to the use of firearms for the purposes of filming, including the use of a certified armourer, and should be contacted by the screen production company as early as possible. Screen Auckland may be able to assist with making the appropriate contact within the police.
4.10.4 Stunts using vehicles
New Zealand Police has a number of requirements relating to the use of stunt vehicles (such as in car crash scenes), including the use of certified stunt drivers. The screen production company should contact the police as early as possible to discuss planned stunts. Screen Auckland may be able to assist with making the appropriate contact within the police.

4.10.5 Stunts with a “copy cat” risk
In order to avoid people copying stunts carried out for screen production purposes, Screen Auckland’s film facilitation team will be able to assist with identifying locations where the risk of “copy cats” occurring is reduced.
5 Glossary

Auckland Council – Auckland Council is the local authority responsible for governing the Auckland Region. Auckland Council has two complementary decision-making parts; the governing body and local boards. The governing body focuses on the big picture and on region-wide strategic decisions. Local boards represent the communities in their area and make decisions on local issues, activities and facilities. The council organisation is responsible for our operation and service delivery, advising the governing body and local boards and carrying out their decisions.

Building consent - Council permission to carry out building work that it considers will comply with the Building Code provided the work is completed in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted with the building consent application.

Bylaw – A rule made by a local authority that requires people, when in a public place, to either do something (e.g. get permission to film in a public place) or not do something (e.g. recklessly fly a drone).

City Centre – This term refers to the city centre of Auckland (also sometimes referred to as the CBD, Central Business District and Central Area). This is the area that falls within the urban motorway system and the harbour edge.

Council-controlled organisation (CCO) – A CCO is a company or organisation in which one or more local authorities control 50 per cent of more of the directors (or trustees) of the company or organisation.

Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan – the rulebook for how council manages the use of natural and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf Islands. The Plan contains policies and rules for activities and development on the islands.

Essential vehicles – vehicles used for the purpose of the filming activity rather than just transport, such as lighting, camera, generator, department trucks, vans and utes.

Filming - The act or period of photographing moving images, be it digitally, on tape, or on film stock, for broadcast on television, in movie theatres or for internal corporate, educational or private use.

Film permit/permit – Permission to carry out filming activity within the Auckland Region. Film permits are subject to conditions.

Location Assistants - assistant to the Location Manager, hired to be on-set at all times before, during and after the filming activity takes place. Location assistants are there to liaise with the public, direct the crew where to park and set-up, and ultimately to make sure the crew and cast are making as minimal impact on the location as possible.
Recce - ‘Recce’ is a military term borrowed by the industry to mean a pre-filming visit to a location, to assess the suitability of the location in terms of logistical and technical issues.

Resource consent – Council permission to carry out an activity that is restricted or controlled by the rules set out in the Auckland Unitary Plan and Hauraki Gulf Islands district plan. Resource consents are subject to conditions.

Screen Auckland Reserved Parking document (SARP) - This document outlines the operational requirements for film productions who wish to reserve parking areas for film activities within the road corridor across the Auckland region.

Traffic management plan or TMP – is a plan for managing temporary changes to traffic (including pedestrian) flows.

Unitary plan – The Auckland Unitary Plan is the rulebook for how Auckland’s natural and physical resources are used. The Unitary Plan contains rules around how different areas in Auckland may be used, including what type of activities you can use land or buildings for temporarily or on a permanent basis.
6 Related policies, publications and websites

Economic Development Strategy
Auckland’s economic development strategy sets out a vision for an economy that delivers opportunity and prosperity for all Aucklanders and New Zealand. To deliver this Auckland needs to have an internationally competitive, prosperous economy that all Aucklanders can benefit from and participate in. Auckland’s Economic Development Strategy sets out the tangible steps we will follow to make this happen.


Screen Auckland website
Screen Auckland’s objective is to ensure the screen industry’s production experience in and around the Auckland Region is seamless. They are the first point of contact for the screen production industry, and can assist with identifying locations and tapping into Auckland and New Zealand’s vast network of experienced and innovative Film Industry professionals.

www.aucklandnz.com/screen

New Zealand Film Commission
New Zealand Film Commission is New Zealand’s national film office, providing information, introductions and support to filmmakers, both internationally and nationally.

www.filmnz.com

ScreenSafe
ScreenSafe supports and promotes health and safety in the New Zealand Screen Sector. ScreenSafe is an industry-wide collaborative effort with backing from the New Zealand Film Commission, New Zealand On Air and Screen Production and Development Association along with other guilds, industry bodies and regional film offices.

http://screensafe.co.nz/

Work Safe
WorkSafe is New Zealand’s primary workplace health and safety regulator. WorkSafe provides a range of information and guidance about health and safety requirements in New Zealand.

https://worksafe.govt.nz/
Civil Aviation Authority
The Civil Aviation Authority regulates civil aviation in New Zealand. If you undertaking aerial filming, then you must comply with CAA regulations. The CAA checks that these rules are being complied with and have the power to take action if they are not. The CAA also monitors safety and security performance throughout the aviation community so that they can direct safety efforts where they are needed most. The CAA also produce safety publications and run safety seminars for the aviation community.

https://www.cae.govt.nz/

The Advertising Standards Authority
The Advertising Standards Authority is an industry funded organisation supporting standards in advertising; it provides a range of guidance notes and codes of practice. Its prime function is to self-regulate advertising in New Zealand.

http://www.asa.co.nz/

The Broadcasting Standards Authority
The Broadcasting Standards Authority is an independent Crown entity responsible for overseeing the broadcasting standards regime in New Zealand. It provides a range of guidance and information about broadcasting standards in New Zealand.

https://bsa.govt.nz/

Department of Conservation – filming on public conservation land
To film anything for commercial purposes on public conservation land you must be granted a concession from the Department of Conservation (DOC). Further information on the concession application process, timeframes, costs and the DOC Code of Practice for film crews undertaking activities on public conservation land is available on the DOC website.


Heritage New Zealand
Heritage New Zealand has responsibilities for archaeological sites under the Heritage NZ Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Archaeological sites are defined as any place in New Zealand including any building or structure that was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900. Modification of an archaeological site is prohibited, unless permission is obtained from Heritage NZ.

http://www.heritage.org.nz/
7 Key New Zealand Legislation

The New Zealand Legislation website - [www.legislation.govt.nz](http://www.legislation.govt.nz) - is the official government website and provides free access to up-to-date electronic versions of New Zealand legislation. Click on the hyperlinks below to directly access an Act, or go to the website and use the easy search engine to find the legislation you are looking for.

The following list sets out key legislation referred to in this document. The list is provided for information only and is not a complete or inclusive list of legislation that you should be aware of when filming in New Zealand.

**Animal Welfare Act 1999** - sets out the obligation of animal owners or people in charge of animals to meet an animal's physical, health, and behavioural needs, and alleviate pain or distress.

**Building Act 2004** - sets out the rules for the construction, alteration, demolition and maintenance of new and existing buildings and structures in New Zealand.

**Dog Control Act 1996** – provides the framework under which councils regulate the control of dogs in their area including where dogs may be exercised off-leash, where dogs must be kept on a leash and where dogs are prohibited.

**Employment Relations Act 2000** - provides the legal framework for all relationships between employees, employers and unions.

**Health and Safety at Work Act 2015** - is New Zealand’s workplace health and safety law. Breaches of the Health and Safety at Work Act are investigated and enforced by WorkSafe New Zealand.

**Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014** - promotes the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand.

**Local Government Act 2002** - provides the framework and powers under which councils operate; including enabling councils to make and enforce bylaws to protect the public from nuisance, to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety, and to minimise the potential for offensive behaviour in public places.

**Local Government Act 1974** – enables the temporary closure of a road for the purpose of film-making or events.

**Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009** – established Auckland Council and sets out matters, in relation to Auckland Council’s structure, functions, duties and powers, that differ from those which apply generally to councils under the Local Government Act 2002.

**Maritime Transport Act 1994** - sets out the legal framework for maritime safety and protection of the marine environment. Allows councils to regulate, through a bylaw, certain activities for the purpose of ensuring maritime safety.
Nga Mana Whenua o Tamaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 – restored ownership of certain maunga and motu of Tamaki Makaurau, as part of a Treaty of Waitangi settlement, to Ngā Mana Whenua o Tamaki Makaurau (the collective group of the 13 iwi and hapū of Auckland). The Act also established the Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority.

Resource Management Act 1991 – regulates how the environment is managed. As well as managing air, soil, fresh water and coastal marine areas, the RMA regulates how and for what types of activities land may be used.

Smoke-free Environments Act 1990 – regulates smoking in workplaces, on public transport, in cafes, restaurants and in certain public places. Regulates the marketing, advertising and promotion of tobacco products and the sponsorship by tobacco companies of products services and events.

Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 - recognises the national, regional and local significance of the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area and promotes the protection and enhancement of its heritage features for present and future generations. The objectives of the Act include to, but are not limited to, to:

- protect, restore and enhance the area for its heritage features;
- ensure that impacts on the area as a whole are considered when decisions are made affecting any part of it;
- to adopt a careful approach when considering decisions that threaten serious or irreversible damage to a heritage feature;
- to recognise and avoid adverse potential, or adverse cumulative, effects of activities on the area’s environment (including its amenity) or its heritage features;
- to maintain the quality and diversity of landscape in the area;
- to manage aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems in the area to protect and enhance indigenous habitat values, landscape values, and amenity values;
- to protect in perpetuity the natural and historic resources of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the people and communities of the Auckland Region and New Zealand.

Wildlife Act 1953 - outlines the protection and control of wild animals and birds and the management of game.
## Attachment C: Local Board feedback and resolutions on the proposed changes to the Auckland Film Protocol
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Upper Harbour Local Board

16 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

The Relationship Manager, Local Board Services, was in attendance to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2019/96

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member U Casuri Balouch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

b) support the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol and provide the following feedback:

i) support option one (status quo) for film permit time-frames, as outlined in paragraph 31 of the agenda report

ii) note that the use of local reserves for filming activities provides a good opportunity for local boards to promote their area.

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED

Rodney Local Board

8 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Resolution number RD/2019/102

MOVED by Member B Bailey, seconded by Member T Berger:

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol

b) provide the following feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol

i. support the proposed changes to the Auckland Film Protocol following the submissions received from the public

ii. request that staff update the public notification processes around filming, with a view to enabling the public to have better visibility of where and when filming is taking place in their area so that people can avoid filming locations as needed

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED
Puketāpapa Local Board

18 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Ben Moomo, Local Board Advisor was in attendance to speak to the report.

Resolution number PKTPP/2019/172

MOVED by Member A-M Couy, seconded by Member E Kumar:

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) request that the Auckland Film Protocols include the following mechanisms:
   i) an ability for the local board to decline a request to film, if it conflicts with
      local plans or policies
   ii) a requirement on film production companies to:
       § advise when drones will be used in filming, as part of their public
          notification
       § adopt a zero waste approach onsite, when filming.

b) note local board feedback will be included in the report to the Environment and
   Community Committee September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed
   changes to the draft Auckland Film Proposal.

   CARRIED

Ōrākei

16 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Heyley King, Local Board Advisor was in attendance to speak to this report.

Resolution number OR/2019/155

MOVED by Chairperson K Parkinson, seconded by Deputy Chairman C. Claridge:

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) receive the summary of consultation feedback on the draft 2019 Auckland Film
   Protocol.

b) provide the following feedback for consideration by the Environment and
   Community Committee in relation to the recommended changes to the draft
   Auckland Film Protocol:

   i) support the objectives of the draft Auckland Film Protocol 2019.

   ii) support strengthening the rules for protecting the environment and
       native species, and managing filming close to Kauri.

   iii) support promoting the use of local businesses to filmmakers.

   iv) support the inclusion of a longer notification period for road closures, in
       particular major arterial roads such as Tāmaki Drive.

   v) support the inclusion that all local policies and bylaws must be adhered
      to such as the Tāmaki Drive Precinct Event Guidelines.

   vi) request that the Governing Body ensure resources are provided to
       adequately enforce the conditions of a filming licence.

   vii) request the Governing Body to strengthen the bylaw permitting drone use
        in residential areas to protect privacy and sensitive ecological areas.

   c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment
      and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the
      proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

   CARRIED
Manurewa

20 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Resolution number MR/2019/130

MOVED by Member R McLean, seconded by Member K Penney:

That the Manurewa Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol

b) support stronger messaging about the importance of respecting Auckland’s natural environment.

c) support stronger messaging around the potential impact of filming on native species such as birds.

d) support conditions to protect against the spread of kauri dieback being placed on film permits in any public open space (controlled by Auckland Council) where kauri are present.

e) support including additional guidance on the use of drones around native birds and in proximity to other users of public open space and adjoining private properties.

f) support including stronger messages around the need for filmmakers to be respectful of other users of public open space, and state that film permits give limited permission to occupy public open space.

g) support include stronger messages around the requirement for filmmakers to comply with the Auckland Council policies, plans, bylaws and the terms and conditions of their film permit.

h) support promoting the use of local businesses to filmmakers.

i) support filmmakers being required to minimise waste and use zero waste practices.

j) recommend that the timeframe for local board feedback on film permits be increased to 5-7 working days.

k) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED

Howick

23 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Resolution number HW/2019/101

MOVED by Chairperson D Collings, seconded by Member G Boles:

That the Howick Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

b) note the Howick Local Board’s views align with the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol and the board has no additional feedback.

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED
Waitematā (unconfirmed)

15 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Resolution number WTM/2019/167

MOVED by Member R Northey, seconded by Deputy Chairperson S Chambers:
That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol

b) provide the following feedback on the draft Auckland Film protocols:

i. support the proposed changes in the review of the Auckland Film Protocols to ensure that the protocol is up-to-date and reflects current legislation and Auckland Council policy and processes

ii. recommend expanding the definition of public to include communities of interest when assessing filming impacts such as businesses, residents and visitors

iii. request that the film impact assessment for filming in public spaces considers any reduction of service levels such as closure of public facilities, i.e. skate parks, basketball courts

iv. recommend that the Auckland Film Protocols restrict filming in high user parks and reserves during high demand times such as school and public holidays

v. request that communication and consultation should include contact with representatives of users of the impacted facility including sporting, recreational or community organisations

vi. recommend that the filming of potentially offensive material is consistent with both policies of New Zealand Government and Auckland Council and that no commercials can be made for showing overseas that would be banned from showing in New Zealand, e.g. commercials for tobacco products

vii. request that this section, 3.4, add at the end “inappropriate examples would include showing the consumption of alcohol or mind altering drugs before potentially hazardous activities like driving, road use, swimming, water sports or operating heavy machinery”

viii. recommend that the Auckland Film Protocols include the requirement for the landowner approval process to consider all impacts as a result of the filming on the users of the parks and park facilities for both local community and communities of interests

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol

d) request twice a year reports on the income and proposed expenditure from filming permit fees.

CARRIED
**Otara-Papatoetoe**

20 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

A copy of the board’s feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol was tabled at the meeting.

A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minute attachment.

Resolution number OP/2019/121

MOVED by Chairperson L. Fulli, seconded by Deputy Chairperson R. Robertson:

That the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

b) endorse the attached feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol. (Attachment A tabled at the meeting).

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED

**Otara-Papatoetoe Submission points**

The Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board would like to see the following prioritised:

**Earlier Notification**

The board does not support the decision made by the Environment and Community Committee to support the current film permit timeframes. The board receives film notifications very late and as a result are put in an unwelcomed position where we are pressured to make discussions without receiving quality advice. We note in the review that anyone wanting to film on the Maunga must engage with the Tupuna Maunga Authority early on. We propose the same process for local boards.

**Maori Responsiveness: Filming impact on lakes, waterways and harbours**

It is the role of Mana Whenua as kaitaki to protect the Awa and visitors of the Awa. Therefore, they should also be involved in blessing the activity beforehand and lifting the protection on leaving (Tapu & Noa).

**Local Board Acknowledgement**

Local Board’s are the governors of our local parks, where most of the filming takes place. We spend ratepayer’s money on their behalf maintaining and upgrading these parks. Therefore, Local Board consent to filming should be conditional to the acknowledgment of the relevant Local Board (and not Auckland Council alone).

**The Otara-Papatoetoe Local Boards would like to thank you for your consideration**
**Henderson Massey**

21 **Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes**

Resolution number HM/2019/119

MOVED by Member W Flawn, seconded by Member B Brady:

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback, received 21 June and 12 July 2019, on the draft Auckland Film Protocol

b) endorse the updated draft Auckland Film Protocol (Attachment B of the agenda report)

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in August 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED

**Aotea / Great Barrier**

15 **Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes**

Note: changes to the original recommendation were made with the agreement of the meeting.

Resolution number GBI/2019/93

MOVED by Chairperson I Fordham, seconded by Deputy Chairperson L Coles:

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol

b) delegate the chairperson in consultation with the board to provide feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol by 30 August 2019

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED
Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback on the Auckland Film Protocol consultation

Context

- Aotea Great Barrier Island lies 90km east of Auckland City in the Hauraki Gulf and is Auckland Council’s most remote and isolated area.
- Over 60% of the island is Department of Conservation (DoC) estate; 43% of which is the Aotea Conservation Park.
- Aotea / Great Barrier Island is an International Dark Sky Sanctuary.
- The island has a permanent population of 950 residents and approximately 1000 off island residents.
- Transport and freight to and from the island is by either plane, a 35-minute flight one way, or by ferry a four-and-a-half-hour trip one way. There is no on-island public transport.

Feedback

Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board supports the proposed changes to the Auckland Film Protocol and provides the following feedback:

1. Aotea / Great Barrier Island has two airfields and several wharves. We request clarification on drone use in the marine space as this is not covered by the protocols nor CAA.

2. Use of drones has increased markedly around the island. We request clarification of the role of filming on social media especially regarding influencers and how commercial operators are being defined within the protocols.

3. Drone use has increased the ability for ‘small operators’ to film. We support less bureaucratic and expensive options to encourage these small operators to apply for permits and adhere to regulations. Options could include fee waivers for operators like film schools, low budget and community groups.

4. Aotea / Great Barrier Island is an International Dark Sky Sanctuary and we request that any filming permits for the island adhere to our Dark Sky Sanctuary lighting standards.

5. Aotea / Great Barrier Island has a Life-long learning Strategy and we support extra emphasis for education over tourism purposes in the selection criteria for filming permits.

6. Due to the unique nature of the island being remote and a mixture of permanent and semipermanent residents, we would suggest that 48 hours notification of filming might be too short and that a longer lead time is required for Aotea / Great Barrier Island permanent and semi-permanent residents.
Devonport-Takapuna

13 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Marie Jenkins and Coreen Adamson were in attendance via electronic link to address the board in support of this item.

Resolution number DT/2019/138
MOVED by Deputy Chairperson G Gillon, seconded by Member J McKenzie:
That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol

b) provide the following feedback on the proposed draft Auckland Film Protocol:

   i. that the protocol puts in place more mechanisms to reduce the impact of filming on community use of public space, including streets; and

   ii. that the protocol puts in place more mechanisms to minimise the impact of filming on planned events scheduled in public open spaces, including sufficient time being provided to prevent stress on public open spaces, reserves and beaches; and

   iii. requests that the permit timeframe is increased to 5-7 working days, which is identified as option 2b to the agenda report.

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

9 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Resolution number MO/2019/133
MOVED by Chairperson L Sosene, seconded by Member C Elliott:
That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

b) provide the following feedback to the draft Auckland Film Protocol:

   · The turnaround time for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to provide feedback on applications to film in the local area is too short. The local board supports extending these timeframes to allow its feedback to be better coordinated and to meet application process deadlines.

   · The local board supports increased restrictions on drones and have many sensitive sites including areas with heritage features. These sites require protecting when drones are used for filming, TV productions, taking photos and research purposes.

   · The local board supports better engagement with tangata whenua when drones are used to ensure tikanga Māori is observed and Te Ao Māori is acknowledged.

   · The local board supports its position on equity, where filming revenue is returned and invested in the local board area to deliver the local board plan outcomes.

   · The local board stresses that the local community be respected and consequently people are not impeded in their use of public space.

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED
Kaipātiki
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Marie Jenkins and Coreen Adamson from ATEED, were in attendance to address the board in support of this item.

Resolution number KT/2019/156
MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Member P Dillon.
That the Kaipātiki Local Board:
   a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.
   b) support the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.
   c) support the option 2 (b): the permit time-frame is increased to 6 – 7 days.
   d) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

   CARRIED

Hibiscus and Bays

17 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Resolution number HB/2019/136
MOVED by Chairperson J Parfitt, seconded by Member V Watson:
That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:
   a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol
   b) provide the following feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol
      i) support the proposed changes to the Auckland Film Protocol following the submissions received from the public
      ii) request that staff update the public notification processes around filming, with a view to enabling the public to have better visibility of where and when filming is taking place in their area so that people can avoid filming locations as needed
   c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

   CARRIED
**Waitākere Ranges**

Resolution number WTK/2019/108

MOVED by Member S Coney, seconded by Deputy Chairperson S Toms:

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

b) endorse the revised draft Auckland Film Protocol and provide any further feedback.

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

d) request that officers report back on the development of an Environmental Framework or similar, for filming in the Waitākere Ranges Heritage area.

e) thank officers Marie Jenkins and Coreen Adamson for their attendance.

**Waiheke**

3 **Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes**

Resolution number WHK/2019/158

MOVED by Chairperson C Handley, seconded by Member J Meeuwsen:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive the summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

b) provide feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

c) delegate the Chair to finalise feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol following feedback from members, noting that no mention is made of local boards within the report.

CARRIED
Waiheke Local Board feedback on the proposed changes to the Auckland Film Protocol

Feedback

Waiheke Local Board generally supports the proposed changes to the Auckland Film Protocol and provides the following feedback.

- The protocol should clearly outline how use of public beaches is managed. There were complaints following recent filming at a local beach, that the filming and crew took most of the shade and public parking from the beach area. Beaches should be prioritised for public use and not closed in their entirety during filming.

- Suggest the addition of:
  - fee waivers for community groups (under clause 2.5 of the protocol).
  - strengthened obligations regarding zero waste and that the permitting team be mandated to provide a list of all zero waste trust providers in the region.
  - a mandatory Kauri Dieback Disease (KDD) management plan requirement when filming in areas containing Kauri.
  - guidelines for local procurement within the area where filming is planned.

- Supports:
  - strengthened provision for wildlife protection with the inclusion of night lighting constraints for wildlife, and due to Dark Skies protections in some areas.
  - conditions relating to the use of drones during filming. Drone use can be extensive on the islands and they are a public nuisance.
  - longer film permit timelines, particularly for commercial companies with large productions.

- Note concern:
  - around identification of locations during filming. Waiheke and the Gulf Islands could be seen as a brand, and it is important to ensure it is portrayed positively.
  - with filming on Waiheke and the Gulf islands which endorses a particular product. There needs to be measures in place to avoid identification of location in these instances.
o over the absence of reference to local boards within the protocol. The local board’s role in landowner approval for parks and open space and for Auckland Transport land needs to be added.

o additionally, early and direct engagement with the local board should be encouraged to provide local knowledge and help mitigate any issues with proposed locations.

In relation to Auckland Council support provided to filming companies, the board:

• supports the introduction of standardised ‘conditions’ that can be developed with the local board which provides guidelines around filming in the local area.

• supports workshops with the film industry involving local boards, landowners and waste management team to develop these conditions and help facilitate issues.

• supports providing local supplier information to the filming industry within regular newsletters and encouraging local procurement.

• supports workshops with the local board for any large budget productions.

Waiheke Local Board
30 August 2019
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki (unconfirmed)
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Resolution number MT/2019/118

[MOVED by Chairperson C Makoare, seconded by Member MM Meredith]

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
- receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol
- endorse the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol
- note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED

Franklin

13 Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Resolution number FR/2019/115

[MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Baker, seconded by Member A Cole]

That the Franklin Local Board:
- receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol
- endorse the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol
- note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.
- request that ATEED brief the Franklin Local Board on opportunities to encourage screen production activity in the Franklin Local Board area on the basis that screen production has the potential to generate local economic development activity.

CARRIED

Whau
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Resolution number WH/2019/113

[MOVED by Chairperson T Mulholland, seconded by Member T Matai]

That the Whau Local Board:
- receive a summary of consultation feedback, received 21 June and 12 July 2019, on the draft Auckland Film Protocol
- endorse the updated draft Auckland Film Protocol (Attachment B).
- note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED
Papakura

9  Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Resolution number PPK/2019/143
MOVED by Member MV Turner, seconded by Member K Winn:
That the Papakura Local Board:
   a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.
   b) endorse the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol, and provides the following feedback:
      i) that the timeframe for local board feedback on film permits be increased to 5-7 working days.
   c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

CARRIED

Albert-Eden

15  Auckland Film Protocol consultation feedback and recommended changes

Corone Adamson – Policy Specialist, and Marie Jenkins – Screen Facilitation Manager, were in attendance to speak to this report.

Resolution number AE/2019/151
MOVED by Member M Watson, seconded by Member B Lee:
That the Albert-Eden Local Board:
   a) receive a summary of consultation feedback on the draft Auckland Film Protocol.
   b) provide the following feedback on the recommended changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol:
      i. support the objectives of the Auckland Film Protocol 2019.
      ii. support strengthening the rules for protecting the environment and native species, and managing filming close to Kauri.
      iii. support promoting the use of local businesses to filmmakers.
      iv. request the protocols specify that all local policies and bylaws must be adhered to.
      v. request the exemption to the Signage Bylaw 2015 be removed from film permit conditions, which allows the use of direction arrows.
      vi. request Governing Body ensure resources are provided to adequately enforce the conditions of a filming licence.
      vii. request Governing Body to strengthen the bylaw permitting drone use in residential areas and sensitive ecological areas.
      viii. request that film permit fees continue to be provided to local boards for funding projects in parks.
      ix. request that road closures are communicated via a flyer and letterbox drop to those affected by them.
      x. request that both local businesses and business associations (where relevant) are informed of filing in retail areas outside of the city centre (section 3.1.1 Hours and days of filming).
      xi. request the following wording changes be made in section 3.1.1 Hours and days of filming - in high use parks and reserves, “...as
agreed with the parks department and Community Facilities department in consultation with the relevant local board(s)."

xii. request that the timing in section 3.1.1 Hours and days of filming – in residential areas and places of accommodation businesses, is corrected to match the noise and vibration rules in the Unitary Plan, that is on weekdays arrival is permitted from 6.00am, but noise can only occur from 7.00am.

c) note that local board feedback will be included in a report to the Environment and Community Committee in September 2019, seeking approval for the proposed changes to the draft Auckland Film Protocol.

d) thank Coreen Adamson – Policy Specialist, and Marie Jenkins – Screen Facilitation Manager, for their attendance.

CARRIED
## Attachment D: Summary of key local board feedback and recommended amendments to the draft Auckland Film Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key feedback</th>
<th>Proposed response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit timeframes</td>
<td>A number of local boards requests that the film permit timeframes be increased from 3-5 working days (status quo) to 5-7 working days.</td>
<td>Film permit timeframes continue to be 3-5 working days, in alignment with the decision made at the June 2019 meeting of the Environment and Community Committee.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially offensive material</td>
<td>One local board requested that section 3.4 of the Auckland Film Protocol be amended to state that commercials may not be filmed in Auckland for overseas broadcast if the content of the commercial is prohibited from being broadcast in New Zealand (e.g., commercials for tobacco products). The local board also requested that section 3.4 be amended to add that inappropriate examples of content would include showing the consumption of alcohol before activities such as driving, swimming or operation of heavy machinery.</td>
<td>Section 3.4 enables consideration of whether content is allowed by or inconsistent with New Zealand law and or with policy of Auckland Council. Auckland Council may decline an application for a film permit if it is not allowed by New Zealand law, is inconsistent with Auckland Council policy or is inconsistent with New Zealand Advertising Standards. Providing specific examples, may by omission, be seen as allowing content which is inconsistent with Council’s legal obligations or policy framework.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement of local boards and their role as landowner</td>
<td>A number of local boards noted that local boards are responsible for the governance of local parks, where much filming takes place. It was recommended that the Auckland Film Protocol acknowledge the role of local boards, in addition to Auckland Council.</td>
<td>The term Auckland Council is used in the Auckland Film Protocol to refer to the Governing Body, Local Boards and the council organisation. Staff recommend minor change to the Auckland Film Protocol to clarify that the term Auckland Council includes local boards and to acknowledge local boards. Staff also recommend that a definition of Auckland Council be added to the glossary.</td>
<td>Amend the objectives section and sections 2.1 and 3.13 and 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Summary of key feedback</td>
<td>Proposed response</td>
<td>Recommended amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Notification                            | That communication and consultation should include contact with representatives of users of the impacted facility such as sporting, recreational or community organisations. That the definition of public should include communities of interest when assessing impacts. | Screen Auckland liaises with a wide range of parties who are likely to be affected by film activity, including regular users of a public open space or facility such as sports or recreational groups.  
Staff recommend that the Auckland Film Protocol is amended to clarify that communities of interest and regular users of public open space are consulted.                                                  | Amend table 1 and section 2.4.                                                                                                                                  |
| Impact on access to public open space   | That assessment of impact should consider the reduction in level of service, such as closures of facilities, for the public. That filming in high-use parks during busy periods such as school holidays should be restricted given the potential impact on park users. | Screen Auckland considers a wide range of factors when assessing the impact of filming including the impact on public access to public open space, particularly during high use or busy times.        
Staff recommend that the Auckland Film Protocol is amended to clarify that levels of service and impact on public access during high use and busy times.                                                   | Amend sections 2.4 and 3.1.1.                                                                                                                                    |
| space and facilities                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | The Auckland Film Protocol puts in place a range of mechanisms to consider, mitigate and manage the impact of filming on public access.                                                                                     
Staff recommend minor change to section 2.4 to clarify that the cumulative impact of filming on public open space is one of the factors that may be considered when assessing an application for a film permit.                                 | Amend section 2.4.                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Compliance with local policies and plans| A number of local boards requested that the Protocol specify that local policies and plans must be complied with.                                                                                                       | When assessing applications for film permits Screen Auckland considers local policies and plans, when they are aware of them. However, it can be challenging to keep up to date with the range of policies and plans put in place by local boards across the region.  
As filming is a region-wide activity it is also important to retain consistency in regulation of the activity across the region.  
Staff recommend no change to the wording of the Auckland Film Protocol, but that where local policies are consistent with region-wide policy, Screen Auckland                                                                 | No change; Screen Auckland to consider local policies which are not inconsistent with region-wide policy.                                                                                                                                                                           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key feedback</th>
<th>Proposed response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dark sky lighting standards</td>
<td>That film permits comply with dark sky lighting standards on Aotea / Great Barrier.</td>
<td>Filming on Aotea / Great Barrier must comply with the lighting standards in the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan; where it does not a resource consent is required. It is recommended that section 3.1.5 be amended to note that in some locations production companies may be required to comply with dark sky lighting standards. When filming occurs on Aotea / Great Barrier it is also possible to include permit conditions to manage the impact of lighting.</td>
<td>Amend section 3.1.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction to section 3.1.1</td>
<td>That the noise and vibration rules outlined in section 3.1.1 should be amended to align with those in the Unitary Plan, allowing set up from 6am but noting that noise can only occur from 7am. Request that section 3.1.1 be amended to refer to Community Facilities and local boards.</td>
<td>It is recommended that section 3.1.1 be amended to clarify that while set up may occur earlier production companies must comply with the noise time rules in the Unitary Plan. It is also recommended that the Protocol is updated to refer to Community Facilities rather than the Parks Department.</td>
<td>Amend section 3.1.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Changes to current operational practice    | Local boards requested that:  
  - notification of residents and businesses affected by the filming activity advises whether a drone will be used for filming  
  - request that both local businesses and business associations (where relevant) are informed of filming in retail areas outside of the city centre  
  - request that road closures are communicated via a flyer and letter box drop to those affected by them  
  - the public notification processes be updated to provide a higher level of | A number of the matters raised by the local boards relate to the notification of affected parties, these are operational matters that do not require a change to the Auckland Film Protocol. Screen Auckland provides production companies with guidance which contains greater detail on requirements for notification of affected residents and businesses. This guidance currently recommends that details of road closures are included in flyer and letter drops and could be amended to include notification of drone use. Wider public notification would be complicated by a range of operational factors including:  
  - the date and / or timing of location filming is subject to change at short notice, as a result of weather and | No change to the Auckland Film Protocol; consider amending notification guidance. Screen Auckland to consider operational approaches to achieving wider notification. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of key feedback</th>
<th>Proposed response</th>
<th>Recommended amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility of where and when filming is occurring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>other considerations, and if notifications were not up-to-date it may not effectively inform potential users; it would be difficult to put in place a single notification platform or media that would reach all potential users of public open space. Putting in place mechanisms for wider notification does not require an amendment to the Auckland Film Protocol and it is recommended that Screen Auckland consider potential operational approaches to achieving wider notification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Out of scope of the review of the Auckland Film Protocol** | Local boards requested that:  
- the Governing Body strengthen guidelines on the use in residential areas to protect privacy and sensitive ecological areas  
- the Governing body ensure that resources are available to adequately enforce the conditions of filming licences  
- request the exemption to the Signage Bylaw 2015 be removed from film permit conditions, which allows the use of direction arrows | A number of the matters raised in local board feedback are out of the scope of the review of the Auckland Film Protocol and would require a change to another policy or would require a change in a service level which is not within the control of Screen Auckland. | No change. |
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Kelly Lucas on behalf of the Screen Guild

Hi Marie,

I am writing on behalf of the Screen Industry Guild Aotearoa NZ Inc and its membership.

We are a non-profit professional incorporated society in the New Zealand screen production industry. We represent crew and campaign for fair and safe working conditions. We offer professional advice, expert opinion and influence throughout the sector.

I would like to submit this email regarding the current Film Protocol proposal.

I would like to confirm that we reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘areas of sensitive interest’.

We feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would need permits and it is not as open to interpretation.

Warm regards,
Kelly

Kelly Lucas
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Screen Industry Guild Aotearoa New Zealand Inc.
(Previously the NZ Film & Video Technicians’ Guild Inc.)

Declan Cahill

I am writing on behalf of Exit Films limited with regards the proposed protocols.

Declan Cahill
EXECUTIVE PRODUCER / MD
1. Under CAA rules 101, permission is required from the property owner - hence if beach is run by Council, then consent is required from Council. **But this has to be an automatic approval / fast process so long as flights are logged and approved by Airshare.**

2. The requirements for a 102 should be removed when drone flying over Regional Parks or any Council land. Again, so long as Airshare approved and Council approved, then 102 should be adequate.

Kind regards

**Phil Aitken:** Filmscouts
Location Scouting & Location Management

---

**Craig Tikao**

Dear Marie

I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that I reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’. This can be found on page 232, section 3.9.

I feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

I have serious concerns that this process is being used to prevent filming out West, when in fact film crews are possibly the best ‘users’ of the natural resources on offer. I say that because we adhere to a policy of leaving the habitats better than when we found them, (unlike many other users).

Kind regards,
Craig
Craig Tikao  
General Manager - Tikao Locations

Lee Bethell

Merlin Scott-Smith

Hi Marie,

Hope all is well.

I’m emailing you as an established Location Manager in the Auckland region to inform you that I reject the word ‘significant’ being removed from the protocol when discussing ‘areas of significant interest’.

The word significant needs to remain in the final Auckland Film Protocol document.

My main objection to the word ‘significant’ being removed is that it will give opportunity for otherwise acceptable permits to be rejected on unfair grounds.

Kind regards,
Merlin Scott-Smith

Anna Saunders

Dear Marie

I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that I reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’. This can be found on page 232, section 3.9.

I feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

Warm regards,
Anna Saunders
Jordi Scott-Smith

Hi Marie,

I am writing in regards to the draft proposed Film Protocol. I object to the word “sensitive” being removed as it opens up too broad an interpretation of locations that would otherwise not be deemed significant or sensitive.

Regards,

Jordi Scott-Smith
Supervising Location Manager
‘Jazz Band’

Intergalactic Productions

Jane Worley

Hi Marie,

I understand that you are involved in the consultation process for the Film Protocol for Auckland City and I’m writing to express my concern around some of the wording of the draft.
Specifically, I think the wording “areas of significant interest” should remain. Removing the word “significant” makes this statement much too vague and open to interpretation. From experience, production companies need some certainty that applications will be dealt with in a consistent and professional manner, rather than a subjective process that can change without notice.

Kind regards
Jane Worley
224 Bethells Road
Bethells Beach

Adair Wheeler#

Hi Marie,

I am writing in regard to my concerns about the current film protocol proposal 2019.

Refer page 232, section 3.9: I submit that that the word ‘sensitive’ should remain in the protocol document when referring to “sensitive natural environments”.

I believe the word ‘sensitive’ aptly describes an area in this which has specific characteristics, differentiating it from other natural environments, requiring particular protection and by remaining in the text it gives clearer guidance for those looking to submit for a permit on what may or may not require permits and gives clearer guidelines for decision makers, thus reducing the risk of it being open to individual interpretation.
Kind regards,
Adair Wheeler#

Chloe Smith

Dear Marie,
I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that I reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’. This can be found on page 232, section 3.9.

I feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

Kindest,
Chloe

Chloe Smith
53 Productions Limited

Karl Beatson-Smith

Dear Marie,
I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that I reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’. This can be found on page 232, section 3.9.

I feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

Warm regards,

Ngā mihi,
Karl Beatson-Smith
Studio & Facilities Manager
“UAP” | GSR Productions Ltd

Luke Wilkinson

Dear Marie,
I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.
I would like to confirm that I reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’. This can be found on page 232, section 3.9.
I feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

Kind Regards,

Luke Wilkinson
Assistant Location Manager | ABC Studios NZ Ltd

---

**Sally Sherratt**

Dear Marie
I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that I reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’. This can be found on page 232, section 3.9.

I feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

Warm regards,

Sally Sherratt

Sally Sherratt | LOCATION MANAGER
BAD GIRL CREEK PRODUCTIONS LIMITED "The Power Of The Dog"
Sue Macky

Hi Marie,

I made a submission on the recent draft film protocols and would like to raise my concern about the word ‘significant’ being deleted from ‘areas of significant interest.’

I believe that by removing the word ‘significant,’ it would potentially be unnecessarily restrictive of the film industry - which is overall an eco-friendly business.

Kind regards,

Sue Macky

Peter Clews

Hi Marie,

I would like to add my voice to Kristian’s on this.

It is baffling that only the Local Boards have the opportunity to feedback at this stage despite the NZAPG (amongst other industry organisations) and a number of location scouts and managers obviously having a far more relevant understanding of the practical implications of the proposed Film Protocol.

I see it as essential that the Environment and Community Committee are able to review the submission that we have made and ensure further consultation with the NZAPG and other relevant industry bodies and practitioners where required.

Best wishes,

Peter

Peter Clews, NZAPG
Producer

Gavin Dennis

Hi Marie,

Sorry my mistake. The issue is removal of the word ‘sensitive’ not ‘significant’ from the wording ‘sensitive natural environment’ found on page 232, section 3.9. of the protocol document.

Kind regards,

Gavin Dennis
Freelance Film Scout
**Brett Higginson**

Dear Marie,

I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that I dislike the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to sensitive natural environments. This is on P 232 section 3.9.

I believe if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document, it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits.

If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact me.

Kind regards
Brett

Brett Higginson
Location Scout / Location Manager
Auckland Film Locations

**Greg Jonkers**

Dear Marie,

I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that I reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’. **This can be found on page 232, section 3.9.**

I feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

If you have any further questions regarding this request please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Greg Jonkers| Director
Jonkers Farm
Heinz Arbaugh

Ghd8P chl

Sarah McIntyre

Dear Marie,

I would like to submit this email regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that we reject the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’ (p. 232, section 3.9).

We feel if the word ‘sensitive’ remains in the protocol document it will give more clarity on the areas that would require permits and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

Warm regards,
Sarah McIntyre on behalf of the McIntyre Family

Sarah McIntyre
Leader Learning Needs and Wellbeing (SENCo)
Year 3 syndicate Teacher
Vauxhall School
**Emma Worley**

Hi Marie,

I am writing to you with regards to the draft film protocol. I work in the the NZ film industry as a production coordinator & manager.

I have concerns with the wording of the document and request that the word 'significant' remain in the document when referring to 'places of significant interest'. Throughout the draft document these areas are also noted as 'sensitive areas' which I believe to also be vague and open to interpretation. Production Companies need some certainty that film permit applications will be dealt with in a consistent and professional manner, rather than a subjective process that may can change without notice.

Kind regards
Emma Worley
Kristian Eek on behalf of NZAPG

Wednesday, 28 August 2019

To: Marie Jenkins, Screen Facilitation Manager at Screen Auckland

CC: NZAPG Executive Committee
    Various freelance location scouts & managers

From: New Zealand Advertising Producers Group

Feedback On the “Redline Version” of the Proposed Film Protocol Document 2019

We have had very limited time to review the proposed redline changes to the new Film Protocol document, but below is our feedback. Overall there are some positive changes in there, but we have strong concerns in regards to a few additions to the document, as well as the lack of response to our NZAPG feedback through the Auckland Council “Have Your Say” process.

We feel very strongly about the below points and hope that this feedback can be included in the final version of the new Film Protocol. Thank you for your consideration!

Additions We Are Concerned About

While we value the added focus on protecting heritage areas, the environment and native species, we are also cautious that this not become go-to reasons for declining permits without clear evidence or without an opportunity to mitigate or protect against any potential risk. Especially viewed under the current situation where one local board member at each local board has almost sole discretion to approve or decline permits. We will keep a very close eye on this going forward and we urge you to do the same. Areas of particular sensitive nature should mostly be known by now. So any additions or extensions to such issues or sensitive areas should not be last minute and will need to up for greater scrutiny before they are used as a reason to deny a filming permit.

2.1 and 3.1) The wording “A film permit gives production companies LIMITED permission to occupy and use public space” needs to be clarified. While we fully appreciate and understand the reason for this addition, we believe there must be an allowance for “full control of a public space for filming if there are significant creative, access or health & safety reasons”. This will not apply to most shots of course, but it’s important that we acknowledge that there will be times when this is required.

4.3.6) Vehicle use on beaches: We understand that vehicle use on beaches is on a case-by-case basis. However, the film protocol should acknowledge that very few film shoots can happen without any vehicles at all. A wording along the lines of “On a case-by-case basis Screen Auckland has the ability to offer an exemption of the no-vehicles rule. The amount of vehicles must be appropriate to the overall size and complexity of the shoot, while also taking into account the amount of equipment that is required for most professional film shoots. If given an exemption, productions should do their utmost to limit vehicle footprint.”
Lack of Response to Our Feedback

We note that none of the below suggestions were taken into consideration for this amended draft. We STRONGLY urge you to reconsider making the below changes before the new document is finalised.

- We believe it’s essential that the document is prefaced by saying “This document is a best practice guide. Some items may be non-negotiable due to H&S regulations and council bylaws, but on a case-by-case basis there is the possibility of exemptions to some of these best practice regulations”. A sentence along those lines is key to show our industry that Auckland Council and Screen Auckland are committed to being a film friendly and commonsense internationally renowned location.

- 1.1) We believe “good reasons not to” approve a film shoot is too vague. We suggest “if the proposed shoot has an adverse impact that cannot be adequately addressed or otherwise managed”. “Adverse impact” is the unitary plan’s wording for refusing filming in a public place. And that should be the benchmark if we truly are to be a “film friendly” destination.

- 2.1) We suggest the following is added to Screen Auckland’s role:
  - Actively promoting filming in Auckland by regularly advocating to Auckland Council, the local boards, COO’s and other stakeholders; highlighting the industry’s economic and cultural benefits to the Auckland region.
  - Advice the film industry of any issues or up-and-coming proposed changes that may impact our industry.

- 4.5.1) We highly suggest that TMP requirements for filming on a bus on public land is removed. Unless the filming is not road legal (for example; too wide due to rigging, etc.) or the filming is restricting or impeding on normal traffic flow, we can’t see any way that a TMP will make the shoot any safer. If the bus is working within legal road rules, we believe a TMP will only draw attention to the film shoot as well as restricting traffic flow and creating an additional disturbance to the public; ALL without any safety benefit.

- 4.6.1) Providing a H&S plans 3 days before a TV commercial shoot is not physically possible as most technical recce only happen 1-2 days before filming (at least for commercials). It is our suggestion that unless a film shoot involves stunts, pyrotechnics or is otherwise working at high risk location or under circumstances that are outside the scope of a normal film shoot (and industry agreed film H&S guidelines), that a film permit can be issued, PENDING receipt of a H&S plan minimum one day before the shoot. If the shoot DOES involve one of the above special situations, a 3 day H&S plan assessment period will be required.

A Final Note

The above points highlight issues that are key in our day to day operations. And ignoring them will only add to current negative perception (both locally and overseas) regarding the complicated film permitting process in Auckland.

Filming in the Auckland region remains a hugely significant area of business activity, and a tourism driver for both Auckland and New Zealand. It is a $2.6 billion industry that provides income to significant numbers of crew, talent, suppliers and local businesses and individuals.

Access to our natural environment like beaches, forests, parks, etc. - remains a key attraction for both local and overseas film clients. The Waitakere Ranges in particular has a number of important filming locations, and any potential reduction in access to Auckland’s unique landscape could have a very significant and negative impact on the whole industry. The film industry has a strong interest in looking after our locations with the upmost care,
thus ensuring longevity. We have a very good record of both safe and considerate use of locations and their natural environments. And if there are genuine issues or particularly sensitive areas, we are fully committed to taking extra care, working closely with local parties, and mitigating any potential risks wherever we can.

Thanks!

Sincerely (on behalf of NZAPG),

Kristian Eek
Producer/Production Manager/Location Scout/NZAPG member

Barry Smith

I second the points made by Kristian.

The Waitakere Ranges specific points alluded to in the redline version of the Film Protocol are of particular concern. I reject the word ‘significant’ being removed from the protocol when discussing ‘areas of significant interest’. I would like to request that the word ‘significant’ remain in the document when referring to ‘places of significant interest’.

The reason being that if this word is removed, it may give any Local Board ability to decline permit applications via the IAP process if they or indeed one of them deem that any area is of any type of interest and could be “damaged” by a film crew filming there. I believe it makes it too open for interpretation. I’ve personally witnessed how misinformed and uneducated local board members can be and wouldn’t want them having increased power to decline film permit applications on a whim.

Drones used on scouts and recces should be subject to the standard CAA rules and for public drone use in parks and on beaches. Eg under a certain weight and flown away from public then no additional permit should be required.

Vehicle use on beaches should be subject to the same rules as to other members of the public. If special access is required eg Te Henga / Bethells Beach or Piha Beach then this should be sought via Screen Auckland in the first instance. Local surf clubs could also be used to assist in granting access. Muriwai and Karioitahi Beaches are of course classified roads and have an online process whereby a permit for vehicle access can be gained and this should also stay status quo.

Ngā mihi,
Barry
Paul Whittington

Dear Marie,

I am writing regarding my concerns about the current Film Protocol proposal 2019.

I would like to confirm that I object to the word ‘sensitive’ being removed from the protocol document when referring to ‘sensitive natural environments’ in section 3.9.

I feel strongly that the word “significant” should be used in place of the word sensitive which had been removed. The addition of the qualifying word “significant” should be included both in the heading of Section 3.9 and within the text throughout the Film Protocol document regarding environmental concerns (such as in Section 3.1.5, Section 3.9, Section 3.12, Section 4.10 and Section 4.10.2). To qualify significant within the document is important, as it gives more clarity and it is not as open to broad interpretation by any parties.

I am concerned that if nothing is identified to qualify the nature of the environment in question then permits could easily be declined with little supporting evidence and with huge detriment to the film industry being able to remain viable in Auckland into the future.

I wish to be kept informed of the outcome,

Warm regards,

Paul Whittington

Vicky Bethell

Dear Marie,

I greatly appreciated talking with you yesterday and for the opportunity to send you my submission regarding the draft Film Protocol (DFP). As I explained in my email earlier this afternoon, the short notice of time for responding meant I was doing my utmost to get it to you by the end of today. When I received your out-of-office reply this afternoon I thought it would still be acceptable to send this to you by this evening.

Thank you for accepting my submission.

Introduction

My main concerns are related to the disproportionate emphasis on environmental protection in the draft Film Protocol (DFP); and that some protocol changes may make filming in Auckland unworkable for productions in the future.
It was helpful that you provided statistics obtained from non-screen sector individuals and organisations as part of the background information sent to the Local Boards on 21 August 2019 regarding the revised Film Protocol.

Importantly, these statistics show, in summary, that the very large majority (95%) of respondents supported Auckland Council’s film friendly approach and, that 86% responded yes or partially yes to the question “Do you think the Auckland Film Protocol does enough to manage the impact that filming has on our public open space and environment?”

Filming is well known to have a very low, if negligible, environmental impact, as productions carefully manage their use of a location and restore it completely to its former state prior the film activity.

Film productions have a vested interest in preserving and enhancing the environments in which they film.

The financial benefit of filming in an area has a positive flow-on effect not only for local communities but for their environment.

Yet despite the very encouraging statistics above, the draft revision of the Film Protocol 2019 has a huge increase in controls around environmental protection, even going so far as to outline only the environmental objectives of the Waitakere Heritage Area Act (WHAA) legislation while omitting objectives (i) to recognise that people live and work in the area in distinct communities, and to enable those people to provide for their social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being and (j) to provide for future uses of rural land in order to retain a rural character in the area.

Filming is a perfect fit for what the WHAA was designed for, enabling economic benefit to the local communities while protecting, utilising and retaining the rural character of the area.
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What is not acknowledged in the introduction is that Film productions are more interested than most industries in maintaining and protecting the locations they use and the environments they work in. Film productions have a vested interest in preserving the locations they use as an ongoing potential location. Filming is a visual industry. The last thing they want to do is ruin the look or viability of a place, nor for that matter the relationships that are involved in utilizing a location. There is no other identified economic industry that has a lesser
environmental impact. Certainly film productions have strong history in restoring all aspects of a location at least back to their former state, if not better, than when they commenced their shoot.

I am a large property owner here at Bethells beach and filming has occurred in this area for many decades, since 1979. Not one person would be able to tell where a particular filming activity has occurred on our property once a production contract is completed. As identified in your recent report to the Local Boards, Bethells Beach has no equivalent worldwide. The stunning natural environment is what attracts filming, yet this environment has been retained in its entirety and the local community too has benefitted from the varied film activities.

The structure of the draft Film Protocol document defines each relevant category clearly, such as heritage and road closures. However, despite there being a category for Environmental considerations, specific wording related to protecting the environment has been added and repeated throughout the DFP in numerous places, for instance in Section 3.1.5, Section 3.8, Section 3.9, Section 3.10, Section 3.12 Section 4.3.6, Section 4.10 Section 4.10.2.

I understand completely your explanation yesterday as to why the draft protocol cannot be changed too much, but I do think that to place all the environmental concerns in one environmental category with relevant subheadings wouldn’t really be too much of a change. By taking the dispersed environmental wording and collating it into one category it would make it consistent with the rest of the document and its format.

I object entirely to the removal of the word sensitive from Section 3.9. However I am concerned that reinstating only the word sensitive into Section 3.9 is insufficient to provide the necessary clarity and certainty to smooth the way for a fair permit process. All environments are sensitive, but only some environments are significant. So therefore I request that the word significant is used in 3.9.

However, either way, I feel very strongly about the wording in Sections 3.1.5, and Section 3.12 saying “Screen Auckland .........will **work with the production company and appropriate stakeholders to plan for and manage these effects; **or to identify an alternative location if the effects cannot be appropriately managed.” This wording is too loose and open to subjective interpretation by the person applying decision-making power on a permit. I think for clarity’s sake it is imperative that the document is clear, objective and consistent, so that it
reflects not only the requirements of Auckland Council, in managing filming applications, but also the requirements of the film productions to have a workable protocol within which to function.

As I said to you when we spoke yesterday, if the permit process is too difficult, film productions won’t just find an alternative location within Auckland itself, they will go either out of Auckland or to another country altogether. It should therefore be very clear in the document that Screen Auckland working with productions to manage and mitigate the circumstances, is very much the priority and only on very rare occasions, under extenuating circumstances, would it be required that a production is directed towards an alternative location. On that basis, my suggested wording regarding this wording for Sections 3.1.5 and 3.12 is written below in the summary.

My concerns above are not for the present, but for the future. Current film activities may be on the increase, but if the revised Film protocol becomes unworkable for productions then there will be a negative impact on the viability of filming in Auckland. They will simply take productions elsewhere. The consequential multimillion-dollar-loss would have a profoundly widespread and negative impact on the Auckland economy.

Summary

I request that:

1. The word “significant” is added to both the heading for Section 3.9 and to the body of writing related to Section 3.9
2. Within Amendment B, in regards to the description of the Waitakere Heritage Area Act (WRHAA), that either objectives (i) and (j) in full are included from the WRHAA, as written in my feedback above; or that the partial inclusion of the objectives of the WRHAA be removed from the Film Protocol altogether, so that Amendment B reads consistently throughout.
3. In Sections 3.1.5 and Section 3.12 change the wording to read “Screen Auckland will inform production companies early on in the process if this is likely to be a consideration at their desired location and: Will work with the production company and appropriate stakeholders to plan for and manage these effects; or, on the rare occasion a location be unable to achieve a permit, work with the production company to identify an alternative location
I spent much precious time in considering the draft Film Protocol 2019 and in writing this submission. Thank you for your time taking my submission into account and using my feedback in the next steps of the process.

Warm regards
Vicky Bethell
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Message from the Associate Minister for the Environment

The Government wants to reduce the risk of harm from waste and increase economic and social benefits from more circular use of resources. We want to reverse the current trend of ever-increasing waste to landfill and aspire to reductions in multiple waste classes by 2020.

This is part of a longer-term goal of moving to a low-emissions, sustainable and inclusive economy for New Zealand.

Over the first 10 years of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA), we have seen exemplary efforts by industry and community leaders to minimise waste within a completely voluntary framework. Local councils have used their half share of the waste disposal levy to actively support local waste diversion, and some businesses have used accredited product stewardship schemes to divert their end-of-life products from waste or harm. Good results have been achieved, and I commend all who have worked to make improvements.

On balance, however, this has diverted only a minority of waste from landfill and we are still losing the war on waste. This is a particular problem where the waste products, such as agrichemicals, refrigerants, tyres, electrical and electronic products (e-waste) and plastics, risk harming the community and the environment. Business and community voices are telling us it is time for more decisive action.

Regulated product stewardship is one of the tools available under the WMA to help design waste out of our economy. New Zealand has not yet used this tool, but we now intend to explore it in partnership with stakeholders. It is important that whatever we create not only benefits from the best overseas experience but is designed to suit New Zealand’s situation and needs.

Development of co-designed and regulated product stewardship schemes must go hand-in-hand with improved onshore recycling infrastructure, an expanded waste disposal levy, improved waste data, improved controls on the burning of farm waste, and proactive government procurement. These supportive measures are all being discussed with stakeholders.

This consultation (stage one) sets the framework for the co-design of regulated product stewardship schemes. The proposed framework has two parts. The first declares the priority products being targeted (tyres, agrichemicals, refrigerants, e-waste, farm plastics and packaging). The second sets common guidelines for schemes dealing with those products.

Future consultation (stage two) will outline details of the schemes co-designed with stakeholders. It will also cover any potential regulations to ‘level the playing field’ and provide appropriate waste reduction incentives, on a priority product-by-product basis.

I encourage you to let us know your views on these proposals.

Hon Eugenie Sage
Associate Minister for the Environment
Contents

Message from the Associate Minister for the Environment 3

Abbreviations 6

Executive summary 7

1 Introduction 8

2 Product stewardship under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 9
   Designing out waste: ‘circular economy’ approach 9
   What is product stewardship? 10
   Priority product declaration 13
   Guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes 13

3 What we are proposing 15
   Timing 15
   A co-design regulated approach 17
   Proposed ‘priority product’ groups 18
   WMA criteria for priority product declaration 21
   Proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes 26
   Next steps 32

4 Consultation process 33
   How to make a submission 33
   For more information 33
   Publishing and releasing submissions 34
   Consultation questions 36

Appendix 1: Results of prior public consultation on product stewardship priorities 37

Appendix 2: Waste minimisation by voluntary product stewardship schemes 39

Appendix 3: Overseas product stewardship case study guidance 42

Bibliography 55

4 Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines: Consultation document
Tables

Table 1: Proposed timing for applications for priority product scheme accreditation 16
Table 2: Summary information relating to Waste Minimisation Act 2008 section 9(2) criteria for declaring priority products 22
Table 3: Proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship scheme design 27
Table 4: Results of public consultation on priority products for enhanced product stewardship: 2005, 2009 and 2014 37
Table 5: Voluntary scheme effectiveness in relation to the criteria set out in subsection 9(2) of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 39
Table 6: Analysis for proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship scheme design: existing Waste Minimisation Act 2008 criteria, recommendations from overseas case studies and proposed guidelines 44

Figures

Figure 1: Comparing ‘linear’ and ‘circular’ economies 9
Figure 2: Inter-relationship and effect of actions under Waste Minimisation Act 2008 sections 9, 12 and 22(1)(a) 12
Figure 3: Indicative regulated product stewardship scheme design 13
Figure 4: Proposed stage one and stage two consultations for product stewardship schemes under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) 16
Figure 5: Summary of 2014 submissions: priority product declaration for end-of-life tyres 38
Figure 6: Summary of 2014 submissions: priority product declaration for e-waste 38
Figure 7: Summary of 2014 submissions: priority product declaration for refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases 38
Figure 8: Summary of 2014 submissions: priority product declaration for agrichemicals and farm plastics 38

Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines: Consultation document 5
Abbreviations

BFRs  brominated flame retardants
CDS  container deposit systems
CFCs  chlorofluorocarbons
EPR  extended producer responsibility
ETS  Emissions Trading Scheme
e-waste  waste electrical and electronic equipment (also WEEE)
GWP  global warming potential
HCFCs  hydrochlorofluorocarbons
HFCs  hydrofluorocarbons
OECD  Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PFCs  perfluorocarbons
POPs  persistent organic pollutants
PROs  producer responsibility organisations
SGG  synthetic greenhouse gases
TDF  tyre-derived fuel
USA  United States of America
WMA  Waste Minimisation Act 2008
WasteMINZ  Waste Management Institute of New Zealand
WEEE  waste electrical and electronic equipment (also e-waste)
WMF  Waste Minimisation Fund

6  Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines: Consultation document
Executive summary

The Government wants New Zealand to have a productive, sustainable, inclusive and low emissions economy. The aim is for a more prosperous and fairer society, and economic growth within environmental limits. Part of this process is designing waste out of the system by transitioning from a linear ‘throw-away culture’ (take–make–dispose) to a circular economy (make–use–return).

The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) has various tools to support this. One of the strongest tools for reversing linear resource use is regulated product stewardship.

Product stewardship is when people and businesses take responsibility for the life-cycle impacts of their products, either voluntarily or in response to regulatory tools.

The Government proposes to take a co-design approach to establishing regulated product stewardship schemes for priority products.

Once something is declared a priority product under the WMA, a product stewardship scheme for the defined product must be developed and accredited as soon as practicable, and a regulatory option to require participation in such a scheme becomes available.

Regulated product stewardship under the WMA is an option for managing classes of products that can cause environmental harm on disposal. When effectively designed and implemented, such systems can shift the costs of minimising harm from products away from the wider community and environment to product designers, producers and users. This can help create market incentives for better product design, reduce environmental impacts, increase materials recovery from products at the end of their life and encourage waste minimisation and resource efficiency.

Regulated product stewardship schemes are used extensively in other jurisdictions to reduce waste. For New Zealand, any such schemes would need to be designed and assessed for their potential effects in local conditions.

A two-stage process is proposed:

- stage one consults on the proposed declaration of six priority products and ministerial guidelines to clarify expected outcomes and attributes of accredited priority product schemes
- stage two will consult progressively by product group through 2019–21 on proposed WMA regulations.
1 Introduction

The Government wants to reduce the risk of harm from waste and increase economic and social benefits from a more circular use of resources. This is part of a longer-term goal of moving to a sustainable, productive, inclusive and low emissions economy for New Zealand. Product stewardship is one of the tools available under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) to help design waste out of the economy thereby making it more efficient.

The Government is proposing a co-design approach to establishing regulated product stewardship schemes for priority products.

Consultation will involve a two-stage process for product stewardship using tools under the WMA.

• Stage one (this consultation) – ‘the framework’ and declaration by notice in the Gazette:
  – ‘priority product’ status for six product groups under the WMA (section 9)
  – ministerial guidelines for the contents and expected effects of product stewardship schemes for priority products under the WMA (section 12)

• Stage two (subsequent design and consultation) – ‘priority product scheme detail’:
  – work with stakeholders to design product stewardship schemes for accreditation for each priority product group
  – consider, and as appropriate consult on, regulations under the WMA that may be required to implement those schemes.

Five of the six proposed priority product groups were the subject of public consultation in 2014: tyres, electrical and electronic products; refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases; agrichemicals and their containers; and farm plastics. However, ministerial priority product stewardship scheme guidelines were not proposed in 2014 and, due to the passage of time, the Government is consulting again to update this information with current views.

The sixth proposed priority product group, packaging, was proposed by submitters in 2005, 2009 and 2014 as a product group that should be included. It is now proposed as a priority product.

We welcome your views. Information on the proposals is in section 3, and information on how to make a submission is in section 4.

Submissions close at 5.00 pm on Friday 4 October 2019.
2 Product stewardship under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008

The Government wants New Zealand to have a productive, sustainable, inclusive and low emissions economy. The aim is for a more prosperous and fairer society, and economic growth within environmental limits.

Designing out waste: ‘circular economy’ approach

A ‘linear’ economy (take–make–dispose, figure 1) is the dominant system globally. Many countries, including several of New Zealand’s trading partners, are now challenging this model as unsustainable. Symptoms of market failure for the linear system include: pollution to air, water and land; climate change; release of persistent toxic substances; unsustainable rates of harvest for food and materials; and loss of species, habitats and ecosystems.

The Earth’s capacity is finite, while the human population and our aspirations for material consumption continue to grow. As a result, global consumption of raw materials and natural ecosystem services is increasing rapidly in a degrading environment. Current evidence indicates we have already stepped over several safe planetary boundaries (Steffen et al, 2015).

The ‘circular’ economy (figure 1) is an alternative model for creating prosperity. The model:

- values resources for their intrinsic worth
- respects and restores the natural cycles for biological materials (make–consume–enrich)
- is restorative and regenerative by design and aims to keep products, components and materials at their highest utility and value (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2013).

Figure 1: Comparing ‘linear’ and ‘circular’ economies

![Diagram comparing linear and circular economies](attachment:A/Item12/LinearCircularEconomy.png)
Actions to phase out aspects of a linear ‘throw-away culture’ are an essential part of a transition to a circular economy. The WMA has various tools to support this.

Bans can be appropriate for specific products that cause environmental harm when disposed of by users, especially when less harmful alternatives are available. New Zealand has taken two steps under the WMA to address the environmental harms of microplastics and marine plastics: it banned plastic microbeads in certain wash-off products (as at 7 June 2018) and single-use plastic shopping bags (as at 1 July 2019).

Regulated product stewardship under the WMA is an option for managing classes of products that can cause environmental harm on disposal, but where market incentives to design more benign alternatives are not strong. When effectively designed and implemented, such systems can shift the cost of minimising harm from products away from the wider community and environment to product designers, producers and users. This can help create market incentives for better product design to reduce environmental harm and ensure products are appropriately disposed of when they become waste.

What is product stewardship?

Product stewardship is when people and businesses take responsibility for the life-cycle impacts of their products, either voluntarily or in response to regulatory tools.

In a linear economy, the people who design and sell products generally do not pay for the disposal costs and environmental harm when their products become waste, nor in most cases do their direct customers. These costs are largely borne by the wider community and future generations.

In a circular economy, the full life-cycle cost and legal signals would directly inform product design and resource cycling. During the transition to a circular economy in New Zealand, these signals can be improved through voluntary or regulated product stewardship tools under the WMA.

The purpose of WMA product stewardship provisions is twofold:

- to encourage (or require) people and organisations involved in the life of a product to share responsibility for ensuring its effective waste minimisation
- to manage environmental harm when it becomes waste (WMA section 8).

Product stewardship scheme participants can include producers, brand owners, importers, retailers, consumers, collectors and reprocessors.

Section 5 of the WMA defines ‘producer’ as a person who:

(a) manufactures a product and sells it in New Zealand under the person’s own brand; or
(b) is the owner or licence holder of a trademark under which a product is sold in New Zealand; or
(c) imports a product for sale in New Zealand; or
(d) manufactures or imports a product for use in trade by the person or the persons.

A ‘product’ is defined as including both packaging and a class of product.
Voluntary product stewardship

Since the passage of the WMA in 2008, the Government has encouraged the development of voluntary product stewardship schemes. New Zealand now has 10 years’ experience of the effectiveness of this approach. This adds to many decades of voluntary experience before the passage of the WMA.

Fourteen voluntary schemes are in operation that have been accredited under the WMA. These encourage voluntary action by producers and consumers to reduce waste and risk of harm for a range of products, for example: packaging, electrical and electronic equipment (e-waste), paint, agrichemicals, lubricating oil, refrigerants, farm plastics, carpet and concrete.

Most voluntary product stewardship schemes (whether accredited or not) experience problems with participation and product recovery rates. For example:

- schemes that set a voluntary levy or fee for responsible end-of-life waste product management discourage participation by producers and consumers, lead to low rates of collection for recycling or treatment, and often do not collect enough levies or fees to cover a full service
- non-members of a voluntary scheme with a levy can charge less for their product and have a market advantage over participating brand owners
- accredited voluntary schemes that deal with only one company’s products (as do seven of the 14 accredited schemes) can have excellent results but will not influence most of that product group.

A summary of voluntary accredited schemes and their success to date is in appendix 2.

Regulated product stewardship

At present, New Zealand has no regulated product stewardship schemes. Numerous examples overseas include: e-waste, tyres, packaging, batteries, vehicles, oil, medicines, paint, agrichemicals, solvents, products with mercury and graphic paper. These schemes typically work by requiring product fees on entry to market and reallocating the funds to ensure products are recycled or safely treated (appendix 3).

To ‘level the playing field’, the WMA offers the option of a ‘priority product’ declaration (section 9) and regulation that prohibits the sale of a priority product except in accordance with an accredited product stewardship scheme (section 22(1)(a)). Without this regulation, participation in an accredited scheme is not enforceable, and the section 22(1)(a) option is only available for declared priority products. Figure 2 summarises the inter-relationship of WMA sections 9, 12 and 22(1)(a).

Other potential regulatory options under the WMA that would help to ‘level the playing field’ for activities include advance product management fees, deposit–return systems and labelling requirements (section 23).
Various terms are used overseas to describe regulated government approaches to product stewardship, including ‘co-regulatory’ (eg, Australia) and ‘extended producer responsibility’ (eg, Europe and North America). Definitions for ‘voluntary’, ‘regulated’ or ‘mandatory’ are not set out in the WMA.

We have chosen the terms ‘regulated’ and ‘co-design’ for this report. ‘Regulated’ relates to priority product stewardship schemes that will need one or more WMA regulations for effective operation. ‘Co-design’ refers to the development of schemes and proposals for regulations with stakeholders.

This consultation is about setting a framework for regulated product stewardship under the WMA, within which co-design of effective product stewardship schemes for priority products can proceed. The framework proposed is to identify priority products, which triggers a requirement to prepare and accredit product stewardship schemes for them, then set guidelines that such schemes would be expected to meet to be accredited.

What would a regulated product stewardship scheme look like?

New Zealand has not yet used the WMA provisions to regulate product stewardship so must look to overseas models to understand how this might work in practice. Hundreds of regulated product stewardship schemes have been designed worldwide, with the most common being product take-back, advance fees, and deposit–refund (appendix 3). Figure 3 shows a high-level indicative design of how an advance disposal fee or deposit–refund system might work in New Zealand.

International experience is that regulated product stewardship schemes are typically managed by a not-for-profit entity (product stewardship organisation or PSO) that represents all
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producers of that product group. The PSO manages funds, contracts for services, operates any funding and take-back system, and reports to government and stakeholders. The role of government is to accredit, monitor and enforce. Indicative relationships between the participants is shown in figure 3. The proposed Stage two would involve co-design of the detail for suitable schemes for New Zealand and consultation on any regulations necessary for effective operation.

Figure 3: Indicative regulated product stewardship scheme design

Priority product declaration

The Minister for the Environment may declare a ‘priority product’ by issuing a Gazette notice under section 9 of the WMA. Once a product is declared, a product stewardship scheme must be developed and accredited as soon as practicable (section 10).

This declaration power has not yet been exercised and is now being proposed (chapter 3).

Guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes

Sections 13 to 15 of the WMA provide requirements for an application for ministerial accreditation of a product stewardship scheme.

The WMA also provides an option for the Minister for the Environment to gazette guidelines about the contents and expected effects of product stewardship schemes for priority products (section 12). Proposed product stewardship schemes must be consistent with any such guidelines, to obtain accreditation, unless the Minister determines the scheme should
nevertheless be accredited. Section 12 may apply to one or more products, and may include, but is not limited to:

- **timeframe**: how long a scheme would last
- **targets**:
  - the expected reduction in harm to the environment from a scheme’s implementation or the expected benefits from reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery or treatment of the product
  - the time within which these are expected to occur
  - the expected waste minimisation, treatment or disposal objectives and when these would be achieved.
- **transparency**: reporting and information requirements, including information to be provided to purchasers, users and handlers of the product
- **timeliness**: when an application for accreditation of the priority product scheme is expected to be made.

This power to set priority product stewardship scheme guidelines has not yet been exercised but is now being proposed (chapter 3).

Well-designed guidelines, while not a statutory requirement, have the potential to significantly improve waste minimisation, harm reduction, resource efficiency and improve incentives for more circular product design. OECD recommendations (OECD, 2016) and others on best practise have been considered in preparing the proposed guidelines.
3 What we are proposing

The Government proposes using several tools under the WMA to increase incentives for people and businesses to take responsibility for the life-cycle impacts of their products. The aim is to reduce the harm posed by certain end-of-life products and design waste out of the system. A two-stage process is proposed (figure 4).

- stage one consults on the proposed declaration of six priority products and ministerial guidelines to clarify expected outcomes and attributes of accredited priority product schemes
- stage two will consult progressively by product group through 2019–21 on proposed WMA regulations.

Six proposed priority products have been selected as a start of the declaration of priority products. They are considered to meet the requirements under the WMA for declaring a priority product. It is proposed to declare six priority products under the WMA:

- tyres
- electrical and electronic products
- agrichemicals and their containers
- refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases
- farm plastics
- packaging.

Timing

Subject to feedback on this consultation, the Government proposes completing the declaration of priority products and ministerial guidelines for accreditation of product stewardship schemes in 2019.

The intent of the proposed approach is to signal to businesses, councils and other stakeholders the Government’s direction and encourage co-designed product stewardship schemes for priority product under the WMA.

The declaration of priority products triggers a requirement for a scheme to be accredited for that product. The ministerial guidelines currently proposed address timing for applications for accreditation as follows (see table 1).
Table 1: Proposed timing for applications for priority product scheme accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of scheme design for the priority product</th>
<th>When application for accreditation (or reaccreditation) is expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing accredited voluntary schemes (eg, refrigerants, agrichemicals, farm plastics)</td>
<td>Within one year from the date of priority product declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes developed with a multi-stakeholder consultation process including, as a minimum, producers, local authorities, major users and existing collectors and recyclers (eg, tyres and potentially e-waste and some packaging types)</td>
<td>Within one year from the date of priority product declaration or the date of proposal completion, whichever comes later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No scheme in place or being developed</td>
<td>Within three years from the date of priority product declaration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timing for implementation of a scheme and its roll-out to all regions will depend on the product group. Details will be expected as part of the accreditation application.
A co-design regulated approach

The Government proposes taking the following co-design approach to establishing regulated product stewardship schemes for priority products:

- setting a framework for regulated product stewardship, by declaring certain products as ‘priority products’
- issuing guidelines that product stewardship schemes applying for accreditation for priority products will be expected to meet
- working with stakeholders to design:
  - appropriate schemes for accreditation under the WMA
  - ways to ‘level the playing field’ (potentially using the WMA or other regulations)
- monitoring scheme outcomes
- making and enforcing any necessary regulations.

Producers of priority products, stakeholders involved in a product’s life cycle, and other interested parties would, as appropriate to their circumstances:

- make submissions on this consultation document
- participate in subsequent co-design processes
- participate in accredited schemes for priority products, including any requirements such as membership or advance disposal fees and provision of data.

This approach should mean the Government can act more quickly and bring in business and social enterprise experience as required. Reasons for this include that government intervention can be slow and business can be far more agile in leading innovation in areas of expertise. Unlike the Government, business can bring to the design process a deep understanding of supply chains, cost-effective logistics, product design, and stakeholder and customer expectations. For example, rather than specifying exactly how producers should get their products back from consumers and process them at end-of-life, the Government can specify broad requirements for convenient and safe product take-back and management. Producers (with their supply and retail chains) and other stakeholders can then design cost-effective methods to deliver these outcomes.

A co-design process will also benefit from including wider stakeholders. Collectors, recyclers and territorial authorities can inform practical sustainable solutions, and advocates for consumers and environmental and community health can highlight non-monetary costs and benefits. Māori must also be part of the co-design process as kaitiaki of the environment with responsibility to protect mauri and as partners with the Crown in good environmental management. This can help strengthen the ‘social licence to operate’ for producers and regulated product stewardship schemes, as well as deliver sustainable outcomes for future generations.

Co-design progress so far

Co-design has begun for some proposed priority products (eg, tyres, agrichemicals, refrigerants) and is under discussion for others. Each product group will have particular design requirements and will need to be co-designed with the relevant stakeholders. However, consistency can be
improved by declared ministerial guidelines on contents and expected effects of product stewardship schemes for priority products. Proposed guidelines are outlined later in the chapter and more detail can be found in appendix 3.

The Government will promote and monitor these processes, and facilitate an appropriate policy response. Waste Minimisation Fund (WMF) support for stakeholder processes is under way for tyres, agrichemicals and refrigerants and is an option for other priority product groups.

**Proposed ‘priority product’ groups**

The Government proposes declaring six groups as priority products (for an explanation of priority product declarations, see chapter 2). Further priority products may be declared later.

This consultation covers proposed priority product declarations for tyres, electrical and electronic products, refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases, agrichemicals and their containers, farm plastics and packaging. Table 2 summarises the reasons these products were selected from among the many in the market, and further details are given in appendices 1 to 3. It is considered that requiring product stewardship schemes for these products will offer significant net benefits for minimising waste and environmental harm and improve economic and employment opportunities.

Five of the six proposed priority product groups were the subject of public consultation in 2014: tyres, electrical and electronic products, refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases, agrichemicals and their containers, and farm plastics. Most submissions supported declaring these groups as priority products. The Minister for the Environment at that time chose not to progress this option.

Packaging has not previously been proposed by the Government as a priority product under the WMA. Submitters on consultations in 2005, 2009 and 2014 commonly recommended that packaging be a priority product. Local authorities have advocated for increased packaging controls, including a container deposit scheme, to reduce the waste management burden on communities and improve the quality of materials, economic return and local employment opportunities. In recent years, increased understanding of the global risks of marine plastics and microplastics in the food chain and ecosystems has strongly contributed to growing community demand for better controls on plastic packaging in particular.

**Local Government New Zealand remit**

Local Government New Zealand provided a remit to the Government in 2016 supported by most local authorities (90 per cent) calling for a nationally mandated beverage deposit system to be implemented within two years. This was reconfirmed in 2018 with a 96 per cent majority and also called for a declaration of priority product under the WMA for tyres, e-waste, agricultural chemicals and plastics. A further 2018 remit requesting the Government to urgently implement

---

1 Called ‘e-waste’ or ‘WEEE’ (waste electrical and electronic equipment) when entering the waste stream.
a comprehensive and mandatory product stewardship programme for tyres attracted 99 per cent sector support.\(^3\)

The 2018 Local Government Waste Manifesto, issued by the Waste Management Institute of New Zealand (WasteMINZ), also called for priority product declaration for tyres, e-waste and agrichemicals, and the introduction of a container deposit scheme to reduce litter and marine pollution (WasteMINZ, no date).

**Proposed scope of priority products**

Waste data in New Zealand is incomplete, and the identification of priority products has been based on information currently available to the Government. Information to improve this assessment is welcome.

The Government is also seeking feedback on the possible scope for these product groups as listed below.

1. **Tyres**
   Potential scope:
   (a) all pneumatic (air-filled) tyres and certain solid tyres for use on motorised vehicles (for cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, tractors, forklifts, aircraft and off-road vehicles)
   (b) all pneumatic and solid tyres for use on bicycles (manual or motorised) and non-motorised equipment.\(^4\)

2. **Electrical and electronic products**
   Potential scope:
   (a) large rechargeable batteries designed for use in electric vehicles, household-scale and industrial renewable energy power systems including but not limited to lithium-ion batteries\(^5\)
   (b) all other batteries (eg, batteries designed for use in hand-held tools and devices)
   (c) all categories of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) defined in Annex II of European Directive 2012/19/EU (eg, ‘anything that requires a plug or a battery to operate’).

---


\(^4\) Tyres used on bicycles (manual or electric), wheelbarrows and trolleys are not covered by the current Tyrewise proposal. These tyres involve other stakeholders and may require a separate scheme. However, the lack of current recycling infrastructure and likely end-of-life processing technologies and markets are similar.

\(^5\) Lead-acid batteries are not currently an issue because the market value for lead creates adequate incentive for effective, commercial post-consumer collection and recycling. However, as technologies change so may this situation, and because lead is a heavy-metal toxin of significance these batteries have not been excluded.
3. **Agrichemicals and their containers (packaging)**  
Potential scope:  
Chemicals in plastic containers up to and including 1000 litres in size that are used for:  
(a) any horticulture, agricultural and livestock production, including veterinary medicines  
(b) industrial, utility, infrastructure and recreational pest and weed control  
(c) forestry  
(d) household pest and weed control operations  
(e) similar activities conducted or contracted by local and central government authorities.  
This includes but is not limited to all substances that require registration under the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997, whether current or expired, and their containers (packaging), which are considered hazardous until they have been triple-rinsed.  
Packaging for veterinary medicines, which includes syringes, tubes and flexible bags, must be phased in under the accredited scheme.

4. **Refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases**  
Potential scope:  
(a) refrigerants: all gases used for heating, cooling and air conditioning that are ozone depleting substances under the Ozone Layer Protection Act 1996 and/or synthetic greenhouse gases under the Climate Change Response Act 2002, and products containing these gases  
(b) methyl bromide and products containing this gas.

5. **Farm plastics**  
Potential scope:  
(a) plastic wrapping materials for silage or hay including, but not limited to, baleage wrap, hay bale netting, baling twine and covers for silage pits  
(b) plastic sacks for packaging agricultural and horticultural commodities including, but not limited to, fertiliser sacks, feed sacks and bulk tonne bags of woven polypropylene and/or polyethylene  
(c) other plastic packaging and products used for agriculture and horticulture including, but not limited to, protective nets, reflective ground covers, and rigid plastic containers other than containers for agrichemicals, detergents, lubricants or solvents.

6. **Packaging (some packaging may be in both categories)**  
Beverage packaging – potential scope:  
(a) Packaging used to hold any beverage for retail sale that has more than 50 millilitres and less than 4 litres of capacity, made of any material singly or in combination with other materials (eg, plastic, glass, metal, paperboard or mixed laminated materials).

---

6 For example, ozone-depleting substances such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), and gases contributing to climate change such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and perfluorocarbons (PFCs).

---
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Single-use plastic consumer goods packaging – potential scope:

(b) Packaging used for consumer goods at retail or wholesale level made of plastic resin codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7, singly or in combination with one or more of these plastics or any non-plastic material, and not designed to be refilled.\(^7\)

Consultation questions on the proposed priority products are listed in chapter 4.

**WMA criteria for priority product declaration**

Box 1 (below) lists the tests that must be met under the WMA before a priority product declaration is made.

---

**Box 1: Requirements in Waste Minimisation Act 2008 for ministerial use of power to declare priority products**

Under section 9 of the WMA the Minister must not make a priority product declaration unless he or she:

- is satisfied that either (a) the product will or may cause significant environmental harm when it becomes waste, or (b) there are significant benefits from reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery, or treatment of the product (section 9(2)(a))
- is satisfied that the product can be effectively managed under a product stewardship scheme (section 9(2)(b))
- has considered the effectiveness of any voluntary product stewardship schemes in relation to these matters (section 9(3)(d))
- has considered public concerns about environmental harm associated with the product when it becomes waste (including concerns about its disposal) and provided the public with an opportunity to comment on the proposal (section 9(3)(b) and (c))
- has obtained and considered the advice of the Waste Advisory Board (section 9(3)(a)).

---

Information relating to the first two of these tests, on which the Minister must be satisfied, is summarised below. Information about the next two tests, which the Minister must consider, is summarised in appendices 1 and 2.

The results of this consultation and a parallel consideration by the Waste Advisory Board will provide the balance of information.

---

\(^7\) Plastic resin codes are defined at: www.plastics.org.nz/images/documents/PDFs/ pnz-id-code-web-2009-1.pdf
Table 2: Summary information relating to Waste Minimisation Act 2008 section 9(2) criteria for declaring priority products

Legend: Does it meet the statutory test? ✓ – meets = – partially meets ✗ – does not meet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WMA 9(2) statutory tests</th>
<th>Summary information to address the statutory test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyres</td>
<td>✓ Tyre dumping and stockpiling can increase the risk of harm from fire and toxic materials entering air, soil and water. Tyres contain about 1.5 per cent by weight of hazardous compounds bound into the rubber. Tyres are designed to be long-lasting. Leaching of toxic material from tyres is more likely if the tyres are cut into small pieces (exposing more surface area) and/or are submerged in water over time. The materials most often found entering water from tyres are manganese, iron, aluminium, zinc, cadmium, lead and volatile organic compounds (e.g. benzene, benzothiazole). Tyre wear on roads also contributes pollutants to the environment when fine tyre fragments are washed by stormwater into waterways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste minimisation benefits (WMA 9(2)(a)(ii))</td>
<td>✓ Tyres contain significant energy (greater than coal) and can be converted to crumb rubber and engineering products. The most common uses of waste tyres overseas are tyre-derived fuel (TDF) and products made with rubber crumb, such as roadway, roofing and flooring. Emerging technologies include pyrolysis (extraction of liquid fuels, steel and carbon black) and de-vulcanisation (recovery of flexible rubber for new products). Expanded recovery systems have the potential to create new income streams and industry onshore. Increased diversion would reduce incentives for dumping and stockpiling, reducing the risk of fire and environmental pollution. Infrastructure for conversion of tyres to TDF, and use of TDF for cement manufacture, is being established with co-funding from the Waste Minimisation Fund (WMF). Full economic operation will require a regulated framework to incentivise recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stewardship effectiveness (WMA 9(2)(b))</td>
<td>✓ Overseas regulated product stewardship schemes obtain much higher diversion rates from landfill than do New Zealand’s: 30 per cent, for example, over 80 per cent in Europe, Japan and the United States of America (USA), and over 90 per cent in Canada and South Korea. New Zealand tyre stakeholders developed the ‘Tyrewise’ proposal in 2012 based on such schemes. This is being refreshed by stakeholders in 2019. The model proposes a per-tyre advance fee that is redistributed to registered tyre collectors and processors on proof of delivery to approved tyre-recovery destinations. The projected cost per car tyre would be around $5.50, while legacy stockpiles are dealt with. This would replace the current ad hoc disposal fee of $2 to $7 per passenger tyre equivalent levied by retailers, which is not necessarily used to fund appropriate tyre disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric and electronic products (including lamps and batteries) Called ‘e-waste’ or waste electric and electronic equipment (WEEE) when disposed</td>
<td>✓ E-waste can contain toxic substances, including lead, cadmium, mercury and brominated flame retardants (BFRs), posing a risk to the environment and human health. These are bio-accumulative toxins, which means they do not biodegrade and accumulate up the food chain. When e-waste is landfilled, toxic substances will leach out over time and mix with any water in the landfill, creating toxic leachate that potentially lasts over hundreds of years. Modern landfill engineering techniques contain leachate but not indefinitely, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WMA 9(2) statutory tests</th>
<th>Summary information to address the statutory test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leachate cycling(^8) increases concentrations. The risk is thus postponed and a potential burden for future generations. E-waste can also contain refrigerants (e.g., refrigerators, freezers, heat pumps) – see below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste minimisation benefits (WMA 9(2)(a)(iii))</td>
<td>V E-waste contains valuable materials in trace amounts, such as gold and ‘rare earth’ metals, as well as larger amounts of resources, such as steel, aluminium, copper, plastic resins and glass. Globally, less than 1 per cent of the most economically critical metals is recovered, including ‘rare earth’ metals needed for many technologies, from touch screens to wind turbines. For most e-waste, the environmental benefits of recycling are not reflected in the market value of e-products at end of life, resulting in a low recovery rate under voluntary systems. Expanded recovery systems have the potential to create new income streams and industry onshore, including greater opportunity for social enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stewardship effectiveness (WMA 9(2)(b))</td>
<td>V Regulated e-waste product stewardship is effectively diverting significant volumes of e-waste from landfill in the European Union, Scandinavia, Switzerland, several USA states, most Canadian provinces, Australia, Japan, Korea, South America and Taiwan. The European average is 49 per cent, compared with less than 2 per cent in New Zealand. The Government sought advice from computer and television brand owners and e-waste recyclers in 2006–08. Two models were proposed, both requiring regulated participation to succeed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agrichemicals and their containers**

| Risk of harm (WMA 9(2)(a)(i)) | V Agrichemicals are, by intent, toxic and pose a risk to human health and the environment if inappropriately used, stored or disposed of. The packaging used to supply and mix agrichemicals is also potentially toxic, until adequately cleaned, and is generated regularly with product use. Farm waste surveys indicate that most of these wastes are going into unlined farm dumps or landfills, being burnt on-farm or stored. Over time, stored waste agrichemicals can enter the environment from perished containers or during natural disasters, in both rural and urban catchments. Some agrichemicals, particularly older ones, contain persistent organic pollutants (POPs). POPs do not degrade in plants, animals or the physical environment and thus accumulate up the food chain, posing a long-term health risk to humans and ecosystems. The most serious of these have been deregistered for use in New Zealand, but they still arise from farm agrichemical collections, particularly when properties change farming systems or farms and homes change ownership. |
| Waste minimisation benefits (WMA 9(2)(a)(iii)) | V Unused or unwanted agrichemicals cannot be recycled. If they cannot be used legally for their intended purpose, they need to be safely neutralised or destroyed to reduce the risk of environmental harm. This problem is compounded if the original packaging or labelling is no longer able to be deciphered and the highest category of disposal for the contents must be taken. Some packaging containing agrichemicals can be recovered and recycled, if triple-rinsed to remove chemical residue (exceptions are oil-based products and POPs or unknowns). |
| Product stewardship | V Effective regulated rural agrichemical schemes are in place overseas, for example, in Brazil, Canada and the European Union. The current voluntary accredited scheme in New Zealand could significantly increase waste. |

---

\(^8\) Leachate cycling is when leachate captured from an installed collection system is reintroduced to the landfill rather than being allowed to enter the environment at that time.
## WMA 9(2) statutory tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WMA 9(2) statutory tests</th>
<th>Summary information to address the statutory test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness (WMA 9(2)(b))</td>
<td>Minimisation benefits, if all producers were required to participate. The stakeholder-led Agrichemical Review 2012 recommended to the Minister for the Environment that ‘priority product’ should be declared for agrichemicals and their containers, links made to registration under the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997, and attention given to improving incentives for consumer participation. Calculations at the time projected costs on agrichemical products under a comprehensive regulated scheme would be about 35 cents per litre for 100 per cent collection of packaging and typical disposal of unused or unwanted agrichemicals, compared with the then voluntary levy of 12 cents. The higher rate would equate to $7 per 20 litre container or about 2 per cent of the product price.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Refrigerants and other synthetic gases

| Risk of harm (WMA 9(2)(a)(i)) | V | Poorly managed refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases are a significant contributor to depletion of the ozone layer and climate change. The risk of fire also increases from the use of flammable hydrocarbon refrigerants to replace some ozone-depleting gases. Under law, it is an offence to knowingly release refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, but this is nearly impossible to monitor or enforce. Most losses to the environment are system leaks from poor design and poorly trained maintenance staff. |
| Waste minimisation benefits (WMA 9(2)(a)(ii)) | V | Reduction of harm is the primary rationale for selecting this waste stream as a priority. Some waste refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases, as well as canisters used for gas storage, can be recovered for reuse. However, product stewardship would primarily ensure that certain refrigerants are safely destroyed and only lower global warming potential (GWP) gases are recycled back into circulation. Lower GWP refrigerants have both the potential to be captured for recycling and economic benefits as the cost of virgin imported refrigerants increases. |
| Product stewardship effectiveness (WMA 9(2)(b)) | V | Refrigerant and synthetic greenhouse gas recovery programmes are in place in Australia, Europe, Japan and the USA. These have much higher recovery rates compared with 20 per cent here (e.g., Norway has 40 per cent, Japan 56 per cent and Australia over 60 per cent). The current voluntary accredited scheme in New Zealand could significantly increase waste minimisation benefits, if all producers were required to participate. In 2014, the estimated costs per product passed on to consumers in a regulated New Zealand scheme were estimated to range from $2 per domestic refrigerator to $133 per refrigerated truck (about 0.3 per cent to 0.5 per cent price increase). |

### Packaging

| Risk of harm (WMA 9(2)(a)(i)) | V | Incorrectly disposed plastic packaging can cause direct harm, such as to marine wildlife, when plastic is ingested or releases toxins to the atmosphere when burnt at low temperatures. Plastics disposed to landfill can enter the environment over time if the landfill is sited so as to be subject to stormwater or sea level rise. Once in the environment, plastics eventually break down into microplastics (small pieces of less than 5 millimetres in size). The risk of microplastics and the toxins they can bring into the food chain is of growing concern. The build up of plastic waste in freshwater and marine environments is a global issue, and plastics make up an estimated 80 per cent to 85 per cent of marine litter. The effect of non-plastic packaging on the environment is connected to the embodied energy, toxicity and ecosystem impacts of continual resource extraction and processing for single-use designs. These are significant for metals and paper, less so for glass and highest for aluminium, unless high |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WMA 9(2) statutory tests</th>
<th>Summary information to address the statutory test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recycling rates can be achieved. Litter also imposes clean-up and amenity value costs. Packaging makes up most of the litter in New Zealand urban areas (56 per cent by count) and five of the top 10 items in beach clean ups. Drinks packaging is about 20 per cent of all litter items by count and three of the top 10 beach clean-up items (plastic drink bottles, caps and lids, and glass bottle pieces).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waste minimisation benefits (WMA 9(2)(a)(iii))

- The costs to collect and manage post-consumer packaging are borne by councils and the wider community, rather than the people who are making packaging, purchasing and disposal decisions. These costs are exacerbated by packaging design and lower cost (e.g., cross-mingling) recycling systems, which frequently reduce the recyclability and commodity value of collected material. These costs include collection, litter control, sorting and recycling, and disposal of non-recyclable material. Increasingly lower-grade post-consumer plastic packaging is unable to be sold into the global market, further increasing costs. Realignment of responsibility for these costs, targeted price incentives, and coordinated product design, collection and recovery systems have the potential to create new income streams and industry onshore, including greater opportunity for social enterprises. Focusing on plastic packaging targets the reduction of major litter contributors.

Product stewardship effectiveness (WMA 9(2)(b))

- Regulated packaging product stewardship is effectively diverting significant volumes of post-consumer waste from landfill (recycling rates above 80 per cent for the best-performing packaging types) and driving the uptake of reusable designs overseas (e.g., Asia, Australia, Europe and North America). While some schemes have added significant costs, design has evolved over the past decade and cost-effective scheme models are now available (e.g., Footplus in Belgium). Container deposit systems (CDS) for beverage containers typically use ‘deposit-return’ to pay for scheme costs and incentivise return by consumers and communities.

Farm plastics

Risk of harm (WMA 9(2)(a)(i))

- Risks from the long-term contribution of microplastics to the environment and food chain relate equally to farm plastics as those from urban catchments. Rural waste studies show burning and burial are the most common methods of farm plastic waste disposal. This risks the release of toxic chemicals to air and soil, creates leachate (which can enter waterways, affecting aquatic life and livestock) and increases health and safety issues.

Waste minimisation benefits (WMA 9(2)(a)(iii))

- Expanded recovery systems have the potential to reduce the risk of harm from current disposal practices and create new income streams and industry onshore.

Product stewardship effectiveness WMA 9(2)(b)

- A regulated farm plastics recovery scheme is present in Ireland but could be better structured for cost-effectiveness. Similar schemes are being investigated by some Australian states. The current voluntarily accredited scheme in New Zealand could significantly increase waste minimisation benefits, if all producers were required to participate.
Proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes

Well-designed product stewardship frameworks can significantly improve waste minimisation, harm reduction, resource efficiency and incentives for more circular product design as New Zealand transitions to a circular economy. Poorly designed frameworks could add cost without delivering expected benefits. These could be from poor oversight and accountability for fees and outcomes, a lack of competition in providing services or by allowing the opportunity for producers\(^9\) to evade participation.

A well-designed scheme in the New Zealand context requires careful planning to transition from low-recovery rates and limited markets to high-recovery rates and enhanced onshore processing in the longer term. A staged approach is essential for:

- matching and managing the collected material
- supporting and developing markets to avoid stockpiling
- reducing risks of market volatility if dependent on offshore markets.

Outcomes and targets at the time of accreditation need to take into account the first accreditation period will contain unanticipated results and adjustments. Co-design and alignment with regional multi-material collection and processing infrastructure offer benefits in this regard.

Requirements in the WMA relating to accreditation application and approval are general in nature to suit both voluntary and regulated schemes. Additional guidelines to ensure robust priority product stewardship schemes are proposed, including greater safeguards for public accountability on producer fees, expenditure and waste minimisation outcomes.

The Associate Minister for the Environment is proposing to gazette guidelines for product stewardship schemes under section 12 of the WMA (for an explanation of section 12 guidelines, see chapter 2). These guidelines would apply to each of the six proposed priority product groups described. Under section 15 of the WMA, before accrediting a scheme, the Minister must be satisfied that it is consistent with any guidelines. The Minister may accredit a product stewardship scheme that is not consistent with any section 12 guideline if Waste Advisory Board advice has been obtained and considered before accreditation.

Box 2 lists the tests that must be met before section 12 guidelines can be gazetted.

---

**Box 2: Requirements in Waste Minimisation Act 2008 for ministerial use of power to declare guidelines for accredited priority product schemes**

Under section 12 of the WMA, before the Minister for the Environment publishes any guidelines, he or she must:

---

\(^9\) As noted in chapter 2, the WMA defines producers to include people who manufacture a product and sell it in New Zealand under their own brand; are the owner or licence holder of a trademark under which a product is sold in New Zealand; import a product for sale in New Zealand; or manufacture or import a product for use in trade by them or their agent.
• obtain and consider the advice of the Waste Advisory Board
• be satisfied adequate consultation has been undertaken with people or organisations that may be significantly affected by the guidelines.

Table 3 outlines the guidelines proposed for gazetted under section 12 of the WMA, and further information on overseas product stewardship schemes is available in appendix 3.

We have considered recommendations from comparative analysis of overseas experience of regulated product stewardship schemes (e.g., European Commission, 2014; OECD, 2016) in preparing proposed section 12 guidelines.

Consultation questions on the proposed ministerial guidelines are listed in the next chapter.

**Table 3: Proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship scheme design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Proposed Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) section 12 guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Intended objectives and outcomes | a) Specify the expected reduction in harm to the environment from the implementation of a scheme and/or the expected benefits from reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery or treatment of the product to which a scheme relates.  
   b) Specify the expected quantifiable waste minimisation and management objectives for the product to which a scheme relates, and the plan to achieve significant, timely and continuous improvement.  
   c) All schemes will be designed to incentivise product management higher up the waste hierarchy in priority order: waste prevention, reuse, recycling, recovery (materials and energy), treatment and disposal.  
   d) For products containing hazardous materials: industry certification and compliance with other legislation for installation or use, maintenance, collection, transport, storage and disposal pathways.  
   e) All schemes will be designed and financed to manage orphaned and legacy products,\(^\text{10}\) as well as current products entering the market. |
| 2. Fees, funding and cost effectiveness | a) The full net costs of collection and management of the priority product (reuse, recycling, processing, treatment or disposal) will be covered by producer and product fees associated with the scheme (e.g., 'producer pays' or 'advance disposal fee').\(^\text{11}\)  
   b) The impact of more than one accredited scheme and opportunities for maintaining competition should be considered in terms of net cost effectiveness (including monetary and non-monetary costs and benefits).  
   c) Specify plans to manage risk to sustainable scheme income, such as price volatility and leakage of materials into other markets. |

\(^{10}\) Legacy products include those sold into the market in earlier years that are now obsolete or banned (e.g., agrochemicals containing POPs). Orphaned products include current or recent products for which a liable producer is no longer present (e.g., e-waste marketed by companies no longer in business).

\(^{11}\) The WMA defines producers to include people who: manufacture and sell a product in New Zealand under their own brand; are the owner or licence holder of a trademark under which a product is sold in New Zealand; import a product for sale in New Zealand; or manufacture or import a product for use in trade by them or their agent.
### Design feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) section 12 guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Specify how existing and emerging technologies will be used to help track and manage product or waste throughout the supply chain (e.g., bar codes, radio frequency identification (RFID), and blockchain).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Governance

| a) | The scheme governance entity will be independent, non-profit and represent producers and wider stakeholders, including public interest. |
| b) | Governance should include wider stakeholders in two types of advisory groups: those including product producers and recipients of product management fees who have technical or supply chain knowledge, and other stakeholders who represent wider community and consumer interests. |
| c) | Structure and accountability of the scheme governance entity will be specified. Clear mechanisms will be implemented to fully control scheme operation, manage non-compliance and report on outcomes. |
| d) | The selection process for scheme directors will be transparent, and scheme governance provisions will follow best practice guidelines for New Zealand.  

### 4. Non-profit status

| a) | Given the prominence of expected net public good outcomes, the default expectation is that all priority product stewardship schemes will be operated by non-profit entities representing key stakeholders. |

### 5. Competition

| a) | The scheme will clearly provide for transparent, non-discriminatory and competitive procurement processes for downstream services, such as collection, sorting, material recovery and disposal. |
| b) | The scheme will ensure that no collectors and recyclers (whether existing, new entrant or social enterprise) are unfairly excluded from participation. This includes making service packages of suitable scale (whether geographically, by material or other measure) to allow both large and small providers to compete fairly. |
| c) | Multiple accredited schemes will be considered if the net community and environmental benefit (including cost-effectiveness and non-monetary impacts) is likely to be improved. |
| d) | Provision will be made for regular independent audit of agreements among competitors. |
| e) | The design process for the scheme will have adhered to guidelines on collaborative activities between competitors as issued by the Commerce Commission, including, but not limited to, applying for collaborative activity clearance from that commission (e.g., Commerce Commission, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c and 2019). |

### 6. Stakeholder engagement and collaboration

| a) | The scheme will specify how wider stakeholders will be involved in decision-making by governance group (e.g., use of stakeholder advisory groups). |
| b) | The scheme will have been designed with the active engagement of stakeholders currently involved in the product end of life (e.g., collectors and recyclers). |

---

12 For example, the Institute of Directors of New Zealand Code of Practice for Directors (www.ioc.org.nz/Portals/0/Publications/Founding%20Docs/Code%20of%20Practice.pdf).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Proposed Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) section 12 guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Compliance</td>
<td>a) The scheme will have a clear means of enforcing compliance of all participants and reporting liable non-participants to the government enforcement agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) The scheme will have strategies to reduce 'leakage' of higher value end-of-life products (eg, ‘cherry picking’ of e-waste components by informal collectors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Targets</td>
<td>a) All schemes will be expected to set and report on targets that have the following characteristics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• significant, timely and continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• benchmarked against and aspiring to attain best practice recovery and recycling or treatment rates for the same product type in high-performing jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a clear time bound and measurable path to move toward attaining best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• targets for new product and market development to accommodate collected materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Results against targets will be publicly reported at least annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Material collection, recovery and disposal rates will be measured against one of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• actual trend data, if the scheme has pre-existed as a voluntary scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the average aggregate weight or count of products sold into the market in the previous three reported years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• another specified method where market entry information does not yet exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Plans will be specified for review, adjustment and reporting on performance targets preferably annually and no less than every three years, taking account of changes in the market, natural events and technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) A clear distinction will be made between funding arrangements and market capacity to manage both potential high volume legacy and orphaned product collections in earlier years and ongoing continuous improvement of collection rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Performance targets will include measures for public awareness of scheme participant satisfaction and a record of response by the scheme to concerns raised. This will be made available to scheme auditors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Timeframes</td>
<td>a) The timeframe within which an application for accreditation or reaccreditation of the priority product scheme is expected to be made after declaration of priority product is as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• priority product categories with existing accredited voluntary schemes (eg, refrigerants, agrichemicals, farm plastics, packaging): within one year from the date of priority product declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• priority product categories with accreditation proposals that have been developed through a multi-stakeholder consultation process including, as a minimum, producers, local authorities, major users, existing collectors and recyclers (eg, tyres): within one year from the date of priority product declaration or the date of proposal completion, whichever comes later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design feature</td>
<td>Proposed Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) section 12 guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• other priority product categories: within three years from the date of priority product declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Within the accredited seven-year period, at least one full review will be undertaken of scheme costs and effectiveness. The results of reviews and proposed scheme amendments to improve cost effectiveness will be reported via the annual reporting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Market development</td>
<td>a) The scheme will have a research and development budget to develop new recycled products, encourage transition to circular product and recycled product materials design, and cooperate with other stakeholders to enhance onshore infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Performance standards, training and certification</td>
<td>a) The scheme will have clear means for ensuring adequate training and certification of all people recovering and managing a product throughout its life cycle, to ensure best practice in prevention and reduction of harm to people and the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Any relevant standards for best practice will be referenced in training, supplier accreditation and monitoring (e.g., AS/NZS 5377 for e-waste collection and processing). The scheme will participate in the development and revision of relevant standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) The scheme will have clear chain of custody arrangements for monitoring processing of materials and reduction of harm, both onshore and offshore, including annual reporting of findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Liability and insurance</td>
<td>a) The scheme will have clear chain of custody arrangements for monitoring receipt and processing of materials and reduction of harm, both onshore and offshore, including annual reporting of findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) The scheme will ensure that liability of parties is clear for each stage of product and materials handling, and adequate insurance for liability is in place at each stage of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Design for environment</td>
<td>a) The scheme will contain financial or other incentives for diversion of collected products to highest and best resource use, weighted for applications higher up the ‘waste hierarchy’ (in priority order: reduction, reuse, recycling or composting, energy recovery, safe treatment and disposal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) The fees paid by a producer to a collective scheme will, as far as possible, be linked to actual end-of-life treatment costs of their products, such as through variable or modulated fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) The scheme will facilitate good communication, feedback and incentives between designers, manufacturers, sales and marketing teams, distributors, retailers, consumers, collectors, recyclers and end disposal operators, to inform improved design of products and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) The scheme will fund initiatives to improve circular resource use by reducing the ‘end-of-life’ components of the product(s) and improving design for reusability and recyclability of the priority product(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design feature</td>
<td>Proposed Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) section 12 guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **14. Reporting and public accountability** | a) The scheme will provide for clear, regular and open reporting and communication with stakeholders.  
b) Annual reports will be made public. These will include measurement of outcomes and achievement of targets, fees collected and disbursed, and net cash reserves held as contingency.  
c) Provision will be made for regular independent financial, compliance, enforcement and environmental audits of scheme performance.  
d) Scheme plans will address the following: data availability, especially when several PROs are in competition; materials’ traceability; precise definition for data collection and reporting (eg, recycling rates and operational costs).  
e) The scheme will have mechanisms in place to protect competitive information relating to detailed operational costs (eg, ‘black box’ data collection by third party with aggregate reporting).  
f) Scheme performance measures will be harmonised between schemes as far as possible. |
| **15. Public awareness**             | a) Branding and clear information on how and why the scheme operates will be easily available at point of distribution (intercompany) and purchase (consumer), point of waste product collection and online, and a link to the online information will be on the product or product packaging.  
b) The scheme will provide for transparent product stewardship fees at point of purchase.  
c) The scheme will ensure that consumer labelling standards for the product are complied with (eg, under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 for hazardous substances).  
d) The scheme will regularly measure and report on public awareness and scheme participant satisfaction, and improvements made accordingly. |
| **16. Monitoring, compliance and enforcement** | a) The scheme will have a clear means of enforcing compliance of all participants and reporting liable non-participants to the government enforcement agency.  
b) The scheme will have strategies to reduce ‘leakage’ of higher value end-of-life products (eg, ‘cherry picking’ of e-waste components by informal collectors).  
c) The Government will enforce WMA regulations.  
d) Revocation of accreditation is possible under WMA section 18 if reasonable steps are not being taken to implement the scheme, and the scheme’s objectives are not being met or are not likely to be met within the timeframes outlined in the scheme. |
| **17. Accessible collection networks** | a) The scheme will provide for an end-of-life product collection system that is reasonably accessible for all communities generating that waste product, whether metropolitan, provincial or rural.  
b) Collection will be free to the public (fully funded by the scheme) for all products covered by the scheme.  
c) Collection will be based on the product, not proof of purchase.  
d) Collections will, as far as possible, share infrastructure and public information with other collection schemes in the area. |
Next steps

This consultation does not cover potential regulations under sections 22 or 23 of the WMA, or other regulations under other legislation, to support the effective operation of a priority product stewardship scheme.

Under the WMA, regulations to support the effective management of a proposed priority product stewardship scheme may include:

- requiring the sale of priority products only in accordance with accredited product stewardship schemes
- prescribing advance environmental disposal fees
- deposit-return frameworks
- labelling or material controls.

The timing of any regulations will vary by priority product group, and will occur once stakeholder working groups have identified scheme option details, including expected costs and benefits.
4 Consultation process

How to make a submission

The Government welcomes your feedback on this consultation document. The questions summarised here are a guide, and all comments are welcome. You do not have to answer all the questions.

To ensure others clearly understand your point of view, you should explain the reasons for your views and provide supporting evidence where appropriate.

You can make a submission in two ways.

- Use our online submission tool, available at www.mfe.govt.nz/consultations/priorityproducts. This is our preferred way to receive submissions.
- Write your own submission.

If you are posting your submission, send it to: Proposed Priority Products and Guidelines, Ministry for the Environment, PO Box 10362, Wellington 6143. Include:

- the title of the consultation (Proposed priority products and guidelines)
- your name or organisation
- your postal address
- your telephone number
- your email address.

If you are emailing your submission, send it to priorityproducts.submissions@mfe.govt.nz as a:

- PDF
- Microsoft Word document (2003 or later version).

Submissions close at 5.00 pm on Friday 4 October 2019.

For more information

Please direct any queries to:

Email: regulated_product_stewardship@mfe.govt.nz
Postal: Proposed Priority Products and Guidelines, Ministry for the Environment, PO Box 10362, Wellington 6143
Publishing and releasing submissions

All or part of any written submission (including names of submitters) may be published on the Ministry for the Environment’s website, www.mfe.govt.nz. Unless you clearly specify otherwise in your submission, we will consider that you have agreed to have your submission and your name posted on our website.

Contents of submissions may be released to the public under the Official Information Act 1982, if requested. Please let us know if you do not want some or all of your submission released, stating which part(s) you consider should be withheld and the reason(s) for withholding the information.

Under the Privacy Act 1993, people have access to information held by agencies about them. Any personal information you send to the Ministry with your submission will only be used in relation to matters covered by this document. In your submission, please indicate if you prefer we do not include your name in the published summary of submissions.
Priority products

Do you agree with the proposed scope for priority product declarations for the following six product groups?

Q1: End-of-life tyres
   (a) All pneumatic (air-filled) tyres and certain solid tyres for use on motorised vehicles (for cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, tractors, forklifts, aircraft and off-road vehicles).
   (b) All pneumatic and solid tyres for use on bicycles (manual or motorised) and non-motorised equipment.
   Yes / No / Not sure / Why / Why not?

Q2: Electrical and electronic products
   (a) Large rechargeable batteries designed for use in electric vehicles, household-scale and industrial renewable energy power systems, including but not limited to lithium-ion batteries.
   (b) All other batteries (eg. batteries designed for use in hand-held tools and devices).
   (c) All categories of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) defined in Annex II of European Directive 2012/19/EU (eg. ‘anything that requires a plug or a battery to operate’).
   Yes / No / Not sure / Why / Why not?

Q3: Agricultural chemicals and their containers
   Chemicals in plastic containers up to and including 1000 litres in size that are used for:
   (a) any horticulture, agricultural and livestock production, including veterinary medicines
   (b) industrial, utility, infrastructure and recreational pest and weed control
   (c) forestry
   (d) household pest and weed control operations
   (e) similar activities conducted by or contracted by local and central government authorities.
   This includes but is not limited to all substances that require registration under the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997, whether current or expired, and their containers (packaging), which are deemed hazardous until such time as triple-rinsed.
   Packaging for veterinary medicines, which includes syringes, tubes and flexible bags, must be phased in under the accredited scheme.
   Yes / No / Not sure / Why / Why not?

Q4: Refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases
   (a) Refrigerants: all gases used for heating, cooling and air conditioning that are ozone-depleting substances under the Ozone Layer Protection Act 1996 and/or synthetic greenhouse gases under the Climate Change Response Act 2002, and products containing these gases.
   (b) Methyl bromide and products containing this gas.
   Yes / No / Not sure / Why / Why not?
Consultation questions

Q5: Packaging
(a) Beverage packaging: used to hold any beverage for retail sale that has more than 50 millilitres and less than 4 litres of capacity, made of any material singly or in combination with other materials (eg. plastic, glass, metal, paperboard or mixed laminated materials).
(b) Single-use plastic consumer goods packaging: used for consumer goods at retail or wholesale level made of plastic resin codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7, singly or in combination with one or more of these plastics or any non-plastic material, and not designed to be refilled.

Yes / No / Not sure / Why / Why not?

Q6: Farm plastics
(a) Plastic wrapping materials used for silage or hay, including but not limited to baleage wrap, hay bale netting, baling twine, and covers for silage pits.
(b) Plastic packaging used for agricultural and horticultural commodities including but not limited to fertiliser sacks, feed sacks, and bulk tonne bags made from woven polypropylene and/or polyethylene.
(c) Other plastic packaging and products used for agriculture and horticulture including, but not limited to, protective nets, reflective ground covers, and rigid plastic containers other than containers for agrichemicals, detergents, lubricants or solvents.

Yes / No / Not sure / Why / Why not?

Ministerial guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes

Q7: Proposed guidelines
Do you agree with the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes outlined in table 3?

Yes / No / Not sure / Why / Why not?

Q8: Changes to guidelines
What changes would you make to the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes?
Appendix 1: Results of prior public consultation on product stewardship priorities


Table 4: Results of public consultation on priority products for enhanced product stewardship: 2005, 2009 and 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product group</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End-of-life tyres</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-waste</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– batteries</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Nthium-ion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerants</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrichemicals</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm plastics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste oil</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-life vehicles</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic bags</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

○ Proposed by government  
● Endorsed by most submissions  
+ Most common additional priority products proposed by submitters

The 2014 consultation focused specifically on the potential declaration of four proposed priority products under the WMA (farm plastics was combined with agrichemicals and their containers). Submissions were particularly sought from key stakeholders, and 216 submissions were received. The spectrum of responses was: 28 per cent industry (non-waste); 17 per cent local government; 14 per cent individuals; 9 per cent waste industry; 15 per cent representative bodies; 5 per cent community recycling organisations; 6 per cent other non-governmental organisations; 3 per cent consultants; 1 per cent academic; and 2 per cent other.

- Industry submissions (waste services, industry-specific representative bodies) primarily commented on their areas of expertise and were supportive of both proposed priorities and government intervention.

- All the local government submissions were positive for prompt action on the four proposed – and other – waste streams. Submitters expressed a view that regulatory intervention from central government could achieve benefits that outweigh the costs.

Results of the 2014 consultation on priority products are summarised by product group below.
Figure 5: Summary of 2014 submissions: priority product declaration for end-of-life tyres

- 69% (140) agreed
- 6% (14) disagreed
- 13% (28) selected unsure or did not specify
- 12% (25) did not comment

Figure 6: Summary of 2014 submissions: priority product declaration for e-waste

- 75% (163) agreed
- 1% (3) disagreed
- 10% (21) selected unsure or did not specify
- 1% (2) did not comment

Figure 7: Summary of 2014 submissions: priority product declaration for refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases

- 86% (177) agreed
- 1% (2) disagreed
- 8% (17) selected unsure or did not specify
- 5% (10) did not comment

Figure 8: Summary of 2014 submissions: priority product declaration for agrichemicals and farm plastics

- 65% (140) agreed
- 2% (1) disagreed
- 13% (29) selected unsure or did not specify
- 21% (46) did not comment
Appendix 2: Waste minimisation by voluntary product stewardship schemes

One of the matters the Minister for the Environment must consider before declaring a priority product is the effectiveness of any relevant voluntary product stewardship schemes. This effectiveness is to be considered in terms of WMA section 9(2) criteria: reduction of environmental harm from the product when it becomes waste and/or creation benefits from reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery or treatment, and ability to manage the product effectively under a product stewardship scheme. Information in this regard is summarised in table 5.

Recycling data in New Zealand is extremely limited, both by product group and in aggregate. This situation was recognised in the 2017 waste levy review (Ministry for the Environment, 2017b) and the recommendations to improve data collection are currently being given effect.

Recycling rates from landfill sites subject to the waste disposal levy must be reported by the levied landfills. However, the data do not allow accurate measurement of actual recycling rates for New Zealand as a whole. This is because the data omit recycling at unleved landfills and materials diverted for recycling before the landfill gate.

A small number of product groups have voluntary product stewardship schemes, and data are reported annually for the accredited schemes. However, the data are provided on a commercial-in-confidence basis, so details are not available for public reporting (except as schemes choose to do themselves). In addition, the data from most accredited voluntary schemes are reported without the context of the total waste generated for the target product group or the total of the collected waste product actually recycled. Thus, efficacy is difficult to assess.

Table 5: Voluntary scheme effectiveness in relation to the criteria set out in subsection 9(2) of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product group</th>
<th>Effectiveness of voluntary product stewardship schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyres</td>
<td>An estimated third of end-of-life tyres are currently diverted from disposal (an estimated 14 per cent are exported whole for reuse and recovery, 13 per cent are processed onshore, 4 per cent are used as silage covers and 1 per cent are used in pyrolysis trials). Data updates are being prepared by several entities in 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The voluntary Tyre Track scheme, co-sponsored by the Motor Trade Association and Ministry for the Environment (2004–09), fostered trading between registered tyre generators and collectors and tracked the fate of the registered tyres. By the end of the programme, about a third of waste tyres were registered but national rates of recycling and illegal dumping were not affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and electronic products (e-waste)</td>
<td>Several limited user-pays and council-pays schemes are in place. The total estimated recycling rate is less than 2 per cent of e-waste. Voluntary schemes include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>eDay</strong>: This was an annual national free collection of e-waste (2007–10), supported by volunteer labour and government subsidy. Despite good public participation, estimated diversion was only about 1 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TV TakeBack</strong>: This was subsidised by the Government in 2012 to minimise e-waste generated by the digital switchover. From October 2012 to March 2014, over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Product group | Effectiveness of voluntary product stewardship schemes
--- | ---
**Agrichemicals and their containers** | 222,000 unwanted televisions were diverted from landfill for recycling, which equalled over 4,000 tonnes of waste. Failure of a major recycler led to a significant inflation of costs to the Government to ensure a complete, safe clean up.
Voluntary WMA-accredited schemes: **RE:MOBILE** (accredited 2014) for all mobile phones, over 72,000 tonnes diverted; **Fujix Zero Landfill Scheme** (accredited 2015) for Fuji-Xerox products, over 1,230 tonnes diverted; and Sharp **Comprehensive Recycling and Waste Reduction Scheme** (accredited 2016) for Sharp products; **TechCollect/Croxley** pilot e-waste scheme started in late 2018. Data have not been reported.
Regional councils and the Government co-funded the collection of legacy unused and/or unwanted agrichemicals (2003–09). Taxpayer costs were $4 million for 640 tonnes. Estimates that most regions would be ‘substantially cleared’ by 2009 led the Government to ask industry and councils to form a product stewardship scheme: the voluntary **Agrecovery Rural Recycling Programme** was accredited under the WMA in 2010. The Government subsidised export and destruction of chemicals unable to be treated onshore from 2009–13. Agrecovery has built a large producer membership but free-rider and non-participation issues remain. User-pays charges for non-member brands or legacy agrichemicals and POPs discourage users, and the levy does not cover a comprehensive and convenient collection. Recovery of containers is estimated to be at 45 per cent to 50 per cent of current agrichemical packaging from members’ levied products.
The **DDT Muster** (Waste Minimisation Fund co-funded) in both urban and rural catchments could not service many bookings due to user-pays requirements at disposal. Although DDT has been banned for decades, products containing it left in storage are still discovered when properties change ownership.
**Refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases (SGGs)** | The **Refrigerant Recovery** voluntary product stewardship scheme started in 1993 and was accredited under the WMA in 2010. It is funded by a voluntary levy on imported bulk refrigerants paid by the major importers. Importers of smaller bulk amounts or pre-charged gas containers have not joined and do not pay. While these importers pay the SGG levy, these funds are not directly available for collection of SGGs for treatment. Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) credits received by the Refrigerant Recovery programme for exported SGGs cover some programme costs. An estimated 20 per cent of available eligible refrigerants are being collected for safe disposal.
Most imported refrigerants are thought to be used to replace leakages caused by poor design and maintenance. The scheme actively promotes an industry code of good practice to reduce risks of harm but has found poor uptake and low levels of training in the industry. Requiring participation in the national scheme would enable enforcement of training standards for refrigerant technicians. The potential risk from poor training is likely to increase as high global warming gases are phased out and flammable non-SGG refrigerants (eg, ammonia) increase.
**Packaging** | Council kerbside recycling services are the main diverter of post-consumer packaging waste, funded by ratepayers either through council or private contracts. Product sales rarely cover collection costs and services are vulnerable to market fluctuations in commodity prices, as highlighted recently with the implementation of China’s National Sword ban on imports of certain recyclables. A recent recycling sector estimate shows that about a third of recycled packaging comes from households and most packaging commodities are exported except glass. National mass balance (tonnage placed on market compared with tonnage recycled) or aggregate diversion data for packaging is not formally reported. In due course, this should improve through implementation of the recommendations of the 2017 waste levy review and the National Resource Recovery working group.

---

*Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines: Consultation document*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product group</th>
<th>Effectiveness of voluntary product stewardship schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 1999 and 2004 voluntary <strong>Packaging Accords</strong> collected mass balance data estimates and encouraged proactive industry response. Under the WMA, several packaging schemes have been accredited:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The <strong>Glass Packaging Forum</strong> scheme (accredited 2010) created a fund from member contributions to support glass container recycling infrastructure. Since accreditation, total collection for recycling has contributed 1.9 million tonnes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The <strong>Public Place Recycling Scheme</strong> (accredited 2013) was built on a government co-funded collection network and works with councils. Since accreditation, total collection for recycling has been over 16,000 tonnes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The <strong>Fonterra Milk for Schools</strong> (accredited 2013) addresses a new waste stream created by use of small-serve single-use packaging to deliver milk to schools. Total waste prevention since accreditation has been over 660 tonnes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The <strong>Soft Plastics Recycling Scheme</strong> (accredited 2018) was Waste Minimisation Fund-subsidised to establish a national collection network. National collection was suspended in 2018 due to lack of viable markets for the collected materials, but a small catchment was re-established in 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm plastics</td>
<td>The <strong>Plasback</strong> voluntary product stewardship scheme was accredited in 2010 and, since then, has diverted over 9500 tonnes of plastics (11,600 since the scheme started). This comprised:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 8600 tonnes of stretch film silage wrap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 570 tonnes of polypropylene (bags, twine, tree guards and packaging)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 300 tonnes of high-density polyethylene containers and vine nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 75 tonnes of medium-density polyethylene irrigation pipes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a user-pays system for farmers using pre-paid collection bags. The scheme is run by a single agricultural plastic supplier and the rest are free-riders. An estimated 70 per cent of bale wrap and nearly 100 per cent of twine, feed bags and crop protection netting are not being collected for recycling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further information on accredited voluntary product stewardship schemes in New Zealand is on the Ministry for the Environment website.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{13}\) See www.mfe.govt.nz/waste/we-all-have-role-play/responsible-product-management/businesses-taking-responsibility-their-for-further-information.
Appendix 3: Overseas product stewardship case study guidance

More than 400 regulated product stewardship or ‘extended producer responsibility’ (EPR) schemes exist worldwide, primarily in Australia, Europe, North America and Northeast Asia. Regulated schemes most commonly cover electrical and electronic products (e-waste), tyres, packaging, batteries, vehicles and oil, followed by medicines, paint, agrichemicals and their containers, products containing mercury (mercury thermostats, auto switches and fluorescent lamps) and graphic paper.

The most common form of scheme is product take-back, followed by advance disposal fees and deposit-refund (Peterson, 2014). Within these are many variations in the level of competition between product stewardship organisations, accountability and reporting, government oversight, and targets. Some generic models have been shown in figure 3 on page 13.

Comparative data, especially concerning scheme costs, is not widely available, which limits the opportunity for a fully comprehensive study of best practice. Even when performance measurement is available, methods can vary between countries (for example, in Europe, recycling rates measure tonnage *delivered to reprocessors*, whereas in Australia these rates measure output *from* the reprocessor).

The most comprehensive study identified was carried out for the European Commission. It looked at 175 EPR product stewardship programmes in member countries, and conducted 36 in-depth case studies where the best data were available (European Commission, 2014). The European Commission found EPRs appeared to have reduced the burden on public budgets and that the best performing schemes in most cases were not the most expensive ones.

Both this study and an earlier study of 11 European and North American schemes (MS2 and Perchards, 2009) found no single EPR or regulated product stewardship model emerged as the best performing or most cost effective.

The 2014 European Commission study offered eight main design principles for effective, regulated product stewardship programmes:

1. clarify intent of regulations
2. clarify roles of sectors
3. ensure system covers full net costs
4. producer fees should be differentiated by end-of-life costs of their products
5. competition framework needs equal rules and adequate surveillance and enforcement
6. ensure transparency of performance and cost data
7. harmonise definitions and reporting between schemes and countries
8. monitoring and enforcement framework must be adequately resourced and involve both government and producers.
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The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) considered this evidence base, combined with other research and case studies, and made recommendations to member states on the improvement of outcomes in four areas (OECD, 2016):

1. scheme design and governance
2. competition
3. design for environment
4. informal recycling sector.

These recommendations are combined in table 6, with supplementary information provided where available.
**Table 6:** Analysis for proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship scheme design: existing Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) criteria, recommendations from overseas case studies and proposed guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</th>
<th>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies$^{14}$</th>
<th>Proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Intended objectives and outcomes | WMA section 15(1)  
The Minister must accredit a product stewardship scheme if he or she is satisfied that the scheme—  
(a) meets the requirements of section 14; and  
(b) is likely to meet the scheme’s objectives within the timeframes set in the scheme; and  
(c) is likely to promote waste minimisation or reduce the environmental harm from disposing of the product to which the scheme relates without, in either case, causing greater environmental harm over the life cycle of the product; and  
(d) is consistent with New Zealand’s international obligations; and  
(e) if the scheme relates to a priority product, is consistent with any guidelines published under section 12. | • Clarify intent of regulation.  
• Clearly articulate objectives of proposed programmes. | • Specify the expected reduction in harm to the environment from the implementing a scheme and/or the expected benefits from reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery or treatment of the product to which a scheme relates.  
• Specify the expected quantifiable waste minimisation and management objectives for the product to which a scheme relates, and the plan to achieve significant, timely and continuous improvement.  
• All schemes will be designed to incentivise product management higher up the waste hierarchy; in priority order: waste prevention, reuse, recycling, recovery (materials and energy), treatment and disposal.  
• For products containing hazardous materials: industry certification and compliance with other legislation for installation or use, maintenance, collection, transport, storage and disposal pathways.  
• All schemes will be designed and financed to manage orphaned and legacy products,$^{15}$ as well as current products entering the market. |

$^{14}$ Sources include: Australian Continuous Improvement Group, 2017; European Commission, 2014; Green and Trebilcock, 2010; MS2 and Perchards, 2009; OECD, 2016; Peterson, 2014.

$^{15}$ Legacy products include those that were sold into the market in earlier years but are now obsolete or banned (eg, agrichemicals containing persistent organic pollutants). Orphaned products include current or recent products for which a liable producer is no longer present (eg, e-waste marketed by companies no longer in business).

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</th>
<th>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies[^14]</th>
<th>Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fees, funding and cost effectiveness |                                                                                                 | • Producers should be responsible for financing the end-of-life costs of their products. Producer and product fees should cover full net costs of collection and treatment.  
• The cost of end-of-life treatment ideally should be internalised into the price of the product and paid for by consumers.  
• Consider ways to manage risks to sustainable scheme income, such as price volatility and leakage.  
• Design fee structures with a robust process and facilitate regular reassessment. | • The full net costs of collection and management of the priority product (reuse, recycling, processing, treatment or disposal) will be covered by producer and product fees associated with the scheme (e.g., ‘producer pays’ or ‘advance disposal fee’)[^16].  
• The impact of more than one accredited scheme and opportunities for maintaining competition should be considered in terms of net cost effectiveness (including monetary and non-monetary costs and benefits).  
• Specify plans to manage risk to sustainable scheme income, such as price volatility and leakage of materials into other markets.  
• Specify how existing and emerging technologies will be used to help track and manage product or waste throughout the supply chain (e.g., bar codes, radio frequency identification (RFID), and blockchain). |

[^14]: The WMA defines producers as people who: manufacture a product and sell it in New Zealand under their own brand; are the owner or licence holder of a trademark under which a product is sold in New Zealand; import a product for sale in New Zealand; or manufacture or import a product for use in trade by them or their agent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</th>
<th>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies (^{14})</th>
<th>Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governance                         |                                                                                                 | • Ensure that stakeholders other than industry are involved in governance eg. local authorities, government appointees. | • The scheme governance entity will be independent, non-profit and represent producers and wider stakeholders, including public interest.  
• Governance should include wider stakeholders in two types of advisory groups: those including product producers and recipients of product management fees who have technical and supply chain knowledge, and other stakeholders who represent wider community and consumer interests.  
• Structure and accountability of the scheme’s governance entity will specified. Clear mechanisms will be in place to fully control the scheme’s operation, manage non-compliance and report on outcomes.  
• The selection process for scheme directors will be transparent, and scheme governance provisions will follow best practice guidelines for New Zealand.\(^{17}\)  
• Given the size of New Zealand’s population and market, the default expectation will be that either a single accredited scheme per priority product, or a clear platform for cooperation between schemes for efficient materials handling, will be part of the design.  
• Given the prominence of expected net public good outcomes, the default expectation is that all priority product stewardship schemes will be operated by non-profit entities representing key stakeholders. |
| Non-profit status                  |                                                                                                 |                                                                     |                                                                                 |

\(^{17}\) For example, Institute of Directors of New Zealand Code of Practice for Directors (www.iod.org.nz/Portals/0/Publications/Founding%20Docs/Code%20of%20Practice.pdf).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</th>
<th>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies(^1^4)</th>
<th>Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>• Competition framework needs equal rules and adequate surveillance and enforcement.</td>
<td>• The scheme will clearly provide for transparent, non-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Product stewardship policies should be as pro-competition as possible.</td>
<td>discriminatory and competitive procurement processes for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waste collection, sorting, and disposal and treatment services should be procured by</td>
<td>downstream services such as collection, sorting, material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transparent and competitive tender.</td>
<td>recovery and disposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agreements among competitors to establish producer responsibility organisations (PROs)</td>
<td>• The scheme will ensure that no collectors and recyclers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should be assessed externally.</td>
<td>(whether existing, new entrant or social enterprise) are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monopoly should not be the default structure for PROs.</td>
<td>unfairly excluded from participation. This includes making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single product stewardship organisations should be allowed only when the benefits outweigh</td>
<td>service packages of suitable scale (whether geographically,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the costs of less competition.</td>
<td>by material or other measure) to allow both large and small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders need to see that proposed interventions are justified, fair and supportive of</td>
<td>providers to compete fairly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>competition. Redistribution of</td>
<td>• Multiple accredited schemes will be considered if the net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community and environmental benefit (including cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>effectiveness and non-monetary impacts) is likely to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision will be made for regular independent audit of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agreements among competitors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The process for designing the scheme will have adhered to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>guidelines on collaborative activities between competitors as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>issued by the Commerce Commission, including but not limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to applying for collaborative activity clearance from that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission (eg, Commerce Commission, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 2019).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design feature</td>
<td>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</td>
<td>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of sectors</strong></td>
<td>WMA section 14</td>
<td>Market share and ‘picking winners’ will be of concern.</td>
<td>Already covered in WMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) list the classes of person involved in the design, manufacture, sale, use, servicing, collection, recovery, recycling, treatment and disposal of the product</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarify roles of sectors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) list the persons who have agreed to participate in the scheme and assign responsibility to them for meeting the scheme’s objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder engagement and collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effectively engage with stakeholders – use a collaborative approach, address concerns.</td>
<td>• The scheme will specify how wider stakeholders will be involved in decision-making by governance group (eg, use of stakeholder advisory groups).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build on the strength of existing systems, infrastructure and networks (eg, sharing resources between product types).</td>
<td>• The scheme will have been designed with active engagement of the stakeholders currently involved in the product end of life (eg, collectors and recyclers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The scheme will specify how existing collection and processing infrastructure and networks will be maximised and new infrastructure and networks co-designed and integrated between product groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design feature</td>
<td>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</td>
<td>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies14</td>
<td>Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Targets       | WMA section 14  
To qualify for accreditation, a product stewardship scheme must:  
(c) set measurable waste minimisation, treatment, or disposal objectives for the product, and timeframes for meeting the objectives. | Targets should be regularly reviewed and adjusted, taking account of changes in the market and technology. | • All schemes will be expected to set and report on targets that have the following characteristics:  
  - significant, timely and continuous improvement  
  - benchmarked against and aspiring to attain best practice recovery and recycling and treatment rates for the same product type in high-performing jurisdictions  
  - a clear time bound and measurable path to move toward attaining best practice  
  - targets for new product and market development to accommodate collected materials.  
• Results against targets will be publicly reported at least annually.  
• Material collection, recovery and disposal rates will be measured against one of the following:  
  - actual trend data if the scheme has pre-existed as a voluntary scheme  
  - the average aggregate weight or count of products sold into the market in the previous three reported years  
  - another specified method where market entry information does not yet exist.  
• Plans will be specified for review, adjustment and reporting on performance targets, preferably annually and no less than every three years, taking account of changes in the market, natural events and technology.  
• A clear distinction will be made between funding arrangements and market capacity to manage both potential high volume legacy
### Item 12

#### Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)

- and orphaned product collections in earlier years and ongoing continuous improvement of collection rates.
- Performance targets will include measures for public awareness of scheme participant satisfaction and a record of response by the scheme to concerns raised. This will be made available to scheme auditors.

#### Timeframes

- The timeframe within which an application for accreditation or reaccreditation of the priority product scheme is expected to be made after declaration of priority product is as follows:
  - priority product categories with existing accredited voluntary schemes (e.g., refrigerants, agrichemicals, farm plastics, packaging): within one year from the date of priority product declaration
  - priority product categories with accreditation proposals that have been developed with a multi-stakeholder consultation process, including as a minimum producers, local authorities, major users and existing collectors and recyclers (e.g., tyres): within one year from the date of priority product declaration or the date of proposal completion, whichever comes later
  - other priority product categories: within three years from the date of priority product declaration.
- Within the accredited seven-year period, at least one full review of scheme costs and effectiveness will be undertaken. The result of reviews and proposed scheme amendments to improve cost-effectiveness will be reported via the annual reporting process.

#### Market development

- The scheme will have a research and development budget to develop new recycled products, encourage transition to circular
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</th>
<th>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies[^14]</th>
<th>Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design for environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Producer fees should be differentiated by end-of-life costs of their products.</td>
<td>• The scheme will contain financial or other incentives for diversion of collected products to highest and best resource use, weighted for applications higher up the 'waste hierarchy' (in priority order: reduction, reuse, recycling or composting, energy recovery, safe treatment and disposal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide supplementary incentives for eco-design elsewhere in the system (e.g., procurement criteria, material content constraints).</td>
<td>• The fees paid by a producer to a collective scheme will, as far as possible, be linked to actual end-of-life treatment costs of their products, such as through variable or modulated fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance standards, training and certification</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assure quality of resource recovery to assure net benefit (both domestic and overseas).</td>
<td>• The scheme will facilitate good communication, feedback and incentives between designers, manufacturers, sales and marketing teams, distributors, retailers, consumers, collectors, recyclers and end disposal operators, to inform improved design of products and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The scheme will fund initiatives to improve circular resource use by reducing the 'end-of-life' components of the product(s) and improving design for reusability and recyclability of the priority product(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The scheme will have clear means for ensuring adequate training and certification of all people recovering and managing that product throughout its life cycle in New Zealand, to ensure best practice in prevention and reduction of harm to people and the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any relevant standards for best practice will be referenced in training, supplier accreditation and monitoring (e.g., AS/NZS 5377 for e-waste collection and processing). The scheme will participate in the development and revision of relevant standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reporting and public accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</th>
<th>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies[^14]</th>
<th>Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WMA section 14</td>
<td>To qualify for accreditation, a product stewardship scheme must:</td>
<td>• Ensure transparency of performance and cost data.</td>
<td>• The scheme will have clear chain of custody arrangements to monitor processing of materials and reduction of harm both onshore and offshore, including annual reporting of findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) provide for assessing the scheme’s performance and for reporting on its performance to the Minister</td>
<td>• Transparency is required for scheme participants, consumers and the public on the performances and costs of the scheme.</td>
<td>• The scheme will provide for clear, regular and open reporting and communication with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(j) set out a strategy for publication of the scheme</td>
<td>• Ensure regular, preferably independent, audits of scheme performance.</td>
<td>• Annual reports will be made public. These will include measurement of outcomes and achievement of targets, fees collected and disbursed, and net cash reserves held as contingency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k) set out how information will be provided to purchasers, users and handlers of the product to which the scheme relates.</td>
<td>• Harmonise definitions and reporting between schemes and countries.</td>
<td>• Provision will be made for regular independent financial, compliance, enforcement and environmental audits of scheme performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^14]: Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines: Consultation document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design feature</th>
<th>Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)</th>
<th>Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies¹⁴</th>
<th>Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible collection networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The scheme will ensure that consumer labelling standards for the product are complied with (eg, Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 for hazardous substances).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, compliance and enforcement</td>
<td>WMA section 14(h) Identify the processes for compliance and enforcement of any agreements between participants to the scheme.</td>
<td>• The Government and obligated industry should be co-responsible for the monitoring and surveillance of extended producer responsibility schemes, and should ensure that adequate means for enforcement are in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring and enforcement framework must be adequately resourced and involve both government and producers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For mandatory systems, the Government should establish a</td>
<td>• The Government and obligated industry should be co-responsible for the monitoring and surveillance of extended producer responsibility schemes, and should ensure that adequate means for enforcement are in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring and enforcement framework must be adequately resourced and involve both government and producers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For mandatory systems, the Government should establish a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Design feature

### Existing WMA requirements for product stewardship scheme accreditation (sections 13, 14 and 15)

### Recommendations in published overseas analysis of case studies 14

- Credible and consistent enforcement framework including, in addition to official accreditation of schemes, registers of producers and appropriate sanctions.
- Free-riding should be addressed through peer pressure and strict enforcement with suitable sanctions.

### Proposed guidelines for priority product scheme accreditation (using WMA section 12)

- The scheme will have clear chain of custody arrangements to monitor receipt and processing of materials and reduction of harm both onshore and offshore, including annual reporting of findings.
- The scheme will ensure liability of parties is clear for each stage of product and materials handling and adequate insurance for liability is in place at each stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability and insurance</th>
<th>Complementary policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide incentives for waste minimisation elsewhere in the system (e.g., ‘pay as you throw’ municipal systems, disposal levies, landfill bans, public procurement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the overseas case study recommendations are about resourcing by the Government, which is not a criterion that product stewardship schemes need to meet for accreditation.
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Proposed priority products and priority product stewardship scheme guidelines: Consultation document


Dear Sir/Madam

Please find attached Auckland Council’s submission in response to the *Proposed Priority Products and Priority product stewardship Scheme Guidelines* consultation document.

Auckland Council welcomes the Ministry for the Environment’s proposal to designate the six identified product groups as Priority Products by the end of 2019 and suggest the inclusion of two additional product categories.

We support the product scope for each priority product as outlined, and the proposed guidelines for accredited scheme design.

The products identified, and the scope for each priority product outlined, align with the vision and objectives of the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

We would like to thank the Ministry for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important issue and look forward to future discussion.

If you require any clarification on our submission please contact me by phone on 021 832 427 or by email at Parul.Sood@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

Nāku noa, nā

Parul Sood
General Manager Waste Solutions
Mihi

I te timātatanga ko Te Kore
i takea mai ai ko te ao tūroa
e nohoa nei e tātou.
I hua mai i reira
ko Ranginui e tū iho nei,
kо Papatūānuku e takoto ake nei.
Ko te korowai ahurei o te rangi
me te takapau horanui o te whenua
e tāwharau nei i a tāua
i te tangata i te wā o te orā.
Engari, ko tō rāua oranga tonu anō hoki
kei roto i ngā ringaringa
O tēnā me tēnā o tātou.
Kāhore he mea i hua ake
i a Papatūānuku
e kore e kōpakina
ki tōna uma i te otinga.
He ao para kore tēnei
i tōna orokohanga mai.
Nā tāua, nā te tangata ia i huri
hei tukunga parahanga.
Me hoki anō ia i a tātou
hei ao para kore i te mutunga.
E te iwi toko ake rā tātou.
Whi tikihia ko te maro Ope Taura
O Papatūānuku,
ko Kaupapa-Rua te tikanga,
kimihia he mahi hōu te whai,
ko hangarua te whakamataara,
ko para kore te taumata whakaaro nui.
Tōturu whakamaua kia tina!
Mā wai rā a Papatūānuku e tiaki
mei kore māku,
mei kore māu?

In the beginning there was The Void
and from it, came the world
that we now inhabit.
From there came
Ranginui, Father Sky who dwells above
and Papatūānuku, Mother Earth here
below.
The fine cloak of Heaven
and the outstretched rug of Earth
who have sheltered you and I –
humankind through this life.
Their own survival however,
rests in the hands
of each and every one of us.
There is nothing borne
of the natural world
that doesn’t, in the end
return to the bosom of Papatūānuku.
This was a world of zero waste
in the beginning.
We, humankind alone turned it
into a dumping ground.
We must make her
waste-free once more.
So, take a stand as a people.
Let us gird ourselves as Warriors
of the Earth, and assent to
Re-purpose being the plan,
Re-use being the driver,
Recycle being the catch-cry
and zero waste – the bold goal.
Let us set ourselves to the task, till it is
done!
Who else will care for Mother Earth
if it isn’t me,
and it isn’t you?

Auckland Waste Management and
Minimisation Plan 2018
Responses to consultation questions

Priority products

Do you agree with the proposed scope for priority product declarations for the following six product groups?

Auckland Council supports the creation of product stewardship schemes for all six priority products. We also support the creation of product stewardship schemes for other products, such as paper and cardboard packaging and commercial sources of plastic packaging.

The current system of disposal for products in New Zealand means that the people who design and sell products do not pay for the disposal costs and the environmental harm when their products become waste. In many cases, the direct customers who buy these products also do not bear these costs. Instead they are largely borne by the wider community and future generations.

Local government authorities in New Zealand are also under significant pressure to manage the costs and challenges of processing recyclables, given the limited end markets for some products such as mixed paper and cardboard and mixed plastics.

Product stewardship schemes create a situation where value is placed on items even when they are at the end of their usable life. Because of this value items are less likely to be illegally dumped or to become litter, which has a positive impact on local communities. Products are also less likely to be produced which require significant reprocessing.

More comment on each specific product group is provided below.

Q1: End-of-life tyres

(a) All pneumatic (air-filled) tyres and certain solid tyres for use on motorised vehicles (for cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, tractors, forklifts, aircraft and off-road vehicles).

(b) All pneumatic and solid tyres for use on bicycles (manual or motorised) and non-motorised equipment.

Yes. We consider that the proposed scope for end-of-life tyres is likely to capture all tyre types capable of creating harm to the environment.

The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 says that council will advocate to central government for the introduction of mandatory product stewardship schemes for tyres.

In our submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s 2014 discussion document we supported tyres being declared a priority product under the Waste Minimisation Act.

Auckland Council also contributed to the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto (developed by the WasteMINZ territorial Authority Forum in January 2018) which proposed that mandatory schemes be set up for tyres.
Q2: **Electrical and electronic products**

(a) Large rechargeable batteries designed for use in electric vehicles, household-scale and industrial renewable energy power systems, including but not limited to lithium-ion batteries.

(b) All other batteries (eg, batteries designed for use in hand-held tools and devices).

(c) All categories of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE defined in Annex II of European Directive 2012/19/EU (eg, ‘anything that requires a plug or a battery to operate’).

Yes. We consider that the proposed scope for electrical and electronic products will capture all products with the potential to create harm to the environment.

We suggest that when a scheme is established, a fuller definition of e-waste, which is compatible with Annex II of the European Directive 2012/19/EU, is published.

Auckland Council currently collects e-waste from the inorganic collection provided to annually to households.

Most e-waste items collected as part of Auckland Council’s inorganic collection are re-distributed for use within the community. However, this isn’t always possible and 12,700 items of e-waste collected through the inorganic collection have had to be re-processed since July 2017. Re-processing alone costs ratepayers $105,000, with further costs for collection.

The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 says that council will advocate to central government for the introduction of mandatory product stewardship schemes for e-waste.

Auckland Council also supported the introduction of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for e-waste through the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto (developed by the WasteMINZ territorial Authority Forum in January 2018).

We also supported e-waste being declared a priority product under the Waste Minimisation Act in our submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s 2014 discussion document.

Q3: **Agricultural chemicals and their containers**

Chemicals in plastic containers up to and including 1000 litres in size that are used for:

(a) any horticulture, agricultural and livestock production, including veterinary medicines

(b) industrial, utility, infrastructure and recreational pest and weed control

(c) forestry

(d) household pest and weed control operations

(e) similar activities conducted by or contracted by local and central government authorities.

This includes but is not limited to all substances that require registration under the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997, whether current or expired, and their containers (packaging), which are deemed hazardous until such time as triple-rinsed.
Packaging for veterinary medicines, which includes syringes, tubes and flexible bags, must be phased in under the accredited scheme.

Yes. We consider that the inclusion of these agrochemicals and containers captures the products and packaging of concern.

Auckland Council supported the introduction of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for agricultural chemicals and plastics through the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto (developed by the WasteMINZ Territorial Authority Forum in January 2018).

Although the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 does not specifically advocate for a mandatory product stewardship scheme for agrochemicals and containers, it does note the need to find solutions for household hazardous waste and rural waste. Auckland Council is therefore, supportive of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for this product category.

The inclusion of household pest and weed control products is a welcome addition to this scope. Household chemicals often use the same base preparations as commercial products and therefore, present the same risk to people and the environment, so should be handled in the same way.

The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 expresses Auckland Council’s intention to develop and implement a strategy for household hazardous waste, consistent with national strategy, to address collection systems, data requirements and public education.

Q4: Refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases

(a) Refrigerants: all gases used for heating, cooling and air conditioning that are ozone-depleting substances under the Ozone Layer Protection Act 1996 and/or synthetic greenhouse gases under the Climate Change Response Act 2002, and products containing these gases.

(b) Methyl bromide and products containing this gas.

Yes. We consider that the proposed scope for refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases will capture the substances capable of creating harm to the environment.

Auckland Council supported refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases being declared a priority product under the Waste Minimisation Act in our submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s 2014 discussion document.

Although the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 does not specifically advocate for mandatory product stewardship for this product category, our plan is guided by the Climate Change Response Act 2002. We have committed to reporting on Council’s greenhouse gas emissions and informing the public about the linkages between waste-generated emissions and climate change. Auckland Council has also recently adopted the draft Auckland Climate Action Framework for consultation which aims to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Auckland Council is therefore, supportive of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for this product category.
**Q5: Packaging**

(a) Beverage packaging: used to hold any beverage for retail sale that has more than 50 millilitres and less than 4 litres of capacity, made of any material singly or in combination with other materials (eg, plastic, glass, metal, paperboard or mixed laminated materials).

(b) Single-use plastic consumer goods packaging: used for consumer goods at retail or wholesale level made of plastic resin codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7, singly or in combination with one or more of these plastics or any non-plastic material, and not designed to be refilled.

We consider that the proposed scope for packaging will capture the major components creating harm to the environment.

However, we suggest that compostable plastic is considered for inclusion in the scope. There is a risk that product manufacturers could opt to package their goods in materials that are not included in a product stewardship scheme, for which there are currently limited recycling options.

The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 says that council will advocate to central government for a national Container Deposit Scheme (CDS) in collaboration with other local authorities.

Auckland Council also supported the introduction of a CDS through the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto (developed by the WasteMINZ Territorial Authority Forum in January 2018).

We also suggested that packaging be included for regulatory intervention in our submission to the Ministry for the Environment’s 2014 discussion document – with a particular focus on beverage containers.

To support our advocacy for a CDS, we commissioned an independent study on the costs and benefits of introducing a national CDS (Cost-benefit analysis of a container deposit scheme, Sapere 2018). This analysis of the potential of a New Zealand CDS found that society would be significantly better off with a scheme in place.\(^1\)

**Q6: Farm plastics**

(a) Plastic wrapping materials used for silage or hay, including but not limited to baleage wrap, hay bale netting, baling twine, and covers for silage pits.

(b) Plastic packaging used for agricultural and horticultural commodities including but not limited to fertiliser sacks, feed sacks, and bulk tonne bags made from woven polypropylene and/or polyethylene.

(c) Other plastic packaging and products used for agriculture and horticulture including, but not limited to, protective nets, reflective ground covers, and rigid plastic containers other than containers for agrichemicals, detergents, lubricants or solvents.

---

Yes. We consider that the proposed scope for farm plastics will capture the items capable of creating harm to the environment.

Although the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 does not specifically advocate for mandatory product stewardship for farm plastics, it does note that solutions need to be developed for rural waste streams. Auckland Council is therefore, supportive of a mandatory product stewardship scheme for this product category.

Ministerial guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes

Q7: Proposed guidelines
Do you agree with the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes outlined in table 3?

Yes, Auckland Council agrees in principle with the guidelines. We are looking forward to being part of the process to develop aspects of the guidelines when this work begins.

Q8: Changes/additions to guidelines
What changes would you make to the proposed guidelines for priority product stewardship schemes?

We support the guidelines as documented.

Other comments
Māori Responsiveness
Through development of the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018, Auckland Council engaged in extensive consultation with mana whenua and mataawaka on resource use and waste management. During the consultation process it was clear that for Auckland’s whānau, hapū and iwi, they have a specific kaitiakitanga role and obligation to people, the environment, and the next generation, ensuring cultural knowledge and practices continue.

Te Ao Māori recognises the traditional system in which nothing was wasted – everything was able to be returned back to Papatūānuku without detriment to the whenua, awa or moana. Recognising and incorporating values such as kaitiakitanga and manaakitanga into the ongoing product stewardship discussion is essential to achieving successful outcomes and upholding Aotearoa’s Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations.
Incorporating mātauranga and tikanga Māori into solutions and decision-making regarding product stewardship, by partnering with whānau, hapū, iwi, and communities will create change and facilitate the transfer of knowledge and actions to and for future generations.

Auckland Council strongly recommends that the Ministry for the Environment undertake ongoing discussions directly with iwi and mana whenua to ensure that Te Ao Māori is incorporated early on in this process and that obligations under Aotearoa's Te Tiriti o Waitangi are upheld.

Balance of stakeholder views

We consider it essential that a fair balance of stakeholder views is taken into account when developing product stewardship schemes. This includes, but is not limited to, Māori, community, industry and local government.

While the business community generally has the resources to participate, in this work, some sectors do not. We suggest that resources are made available to ensure that the community and not for profit sectors will be able to participate fully.

Additional product categories for inclusion

1. Commercial sources of plastic packaging

Auckland Council is concerned about the lack of diversion opportunities for plastic packaging from business/commercial sources and recommends that an additional product category is included to address this material. Our nine-point action plan laid out in the 2018 WMMP includes working with industry to find ways of reducing commercial plastic waste.

One example is the large volume of plastic packaging generated on building and construction projects. We will be undertaking work to quantify the amount of this material, but initial estimates suggest that around 200,000 tonnes of plastic is entering landfill each year from construction activity.

One of the most significant individual sources is LDPE building wrap which is generated in large volumes during urban building restoration but is not currently recycled, even though it is made of the same resin type as silage wrap.

Including products produced in large volumes with similar recycling methodologies may increase the scale and feasibility for on-shore reprocessing and lead to significant reductions in waste to landfill.

2. Paper and cardboard packaging

Auckland Council would also like to see paper and cardboard packaging included as an additional product category.

The recent restrictions on export of paper and cardboard to China has put local authorities and recyclers across the country under severe pressure. Alternate markets and uses for this material are being sought but a long-term solution is required. A mandatory product stewardship scheme, such as that operating in British Columbia, would ensure

---

2 Auckland Council Construction and Demolition Waste Cost Benefit Analysis 2019
manufacturers design paper and cardboard packaging to be part of the circular economy, and would help to support local processing capacity.
Disability Advisory Panel Achievements 2016-2019

The Disability Advisory Panel began its meetings for this term in April 2017 and has captured a wide range of disability perspectives.

Membership

The panel began with eight members: Colleen Brown, Dan Buckingham, Jade Farrar, Philip Patston, Rachel Peterson, Mary Schnackenberg, Gemma Stewart, and Ursula Thynne.

Colleen Brown, Philip Patston and Gemma Stewart resigned from the panel weakening the panel's cohesion and breadth of perspectives. However, Kramer Høeflich from the Youth Advisory Panel joined the panel as an observer, bringing a Pacifica perspective to the disability conversations.

Philip Patston was the panel's first chair until his resignation. Mary Schnackenberg was elected chair in September 2018. Dan Buckingham was the deputy chair throughout the period.

The panel has been strongly supported by Liaison Councillor Josephine Bartley.

Presentations from council staff

The panel received several presentations from staff which significantly broadened the perspectives of all involved. While resource limitations often limit what council is able to achieve, it was pleasing to see staff returning to the panel to check on work programme progress and receive more guidance and encouragement from the panel.

Disability Operational Action Plan December 2015

This plan was initiated by the 2013-2016 panel. The panel has been monitoring its implementation receiving several reports from staff. Council staff have reported genuine progress in some areas. The panel is very pleased to see progress with, for example, improved access to public swimming pools and beaches, especially for wheelchair users.

The panel is actively involved in providing advice on the next iteration of the plan which is being coordinated by the Diversity and Inclusion team.

Accessible Housing

Following on from work initiated by two previous Disability Advisory Panels, in March 2018 this panel raised the lack of accessible housing in its recommendations on council's ten-year budget and 30-year plan. Specific recommendations were:
• That Council provides speedier consent processes for developers who provide affordable accessible housing (private and social).
• That Council provides financial incentives through rates for accessibility features or retrofitting.
• That Council consults with the Panel about engaging with central government to prioritise housing issues for those with disabilities including conflicting policies that prevent people from being eligible for accessible social housing.
• Within the context of the Auckland Plan and Long Term Plan documents, the panel recommends adding the word “accessible” wherever housing is discussed.
• That Council implements their tools wherever possible: Auckland Design Manual; Universal Design Tool.

At its 4 October 2018 meeting the Disability Advisory Panel resolved:
a) noted the presentation from the Auckland Design Office.
b) recommended that Auckland Council add Universal Design Standards for housing to the Unitary Plan, recognising that the Unitary Plan is open for review after two years of operation.
c) recommended that council include universal access provisions in the Auckland Housing Programme, and acknowledged the considerable evidence of a serious shortage of accessible rental properties, and accessible, affordable housing in Auckland.
d) recommended that council advocate to Government for universal access provisions to be incorporated into the KiwiBuild programme, and acknowledged that the need for accessible housing will grow as the population of senior citizens increases.

In December 2018 council wrote to the Minister for Building and Construction calling on government to introduce universal design principles to the building of new houses.

On 18 April 2019 council (with two representatives from the panel) met with Ministers Twyford, Sepuloni and Salea to discuss how accessible housing might best be implemented in legislation/regulations by government.

On 16 May 2019 the Community Development and Safety Committee held a joint meeting with the panel, the theme of which was accessible housing. Three speakers discussed serious flaws in the design of Hobsonville Point, human rights issues raised by the UN Convention Committee, and practical difficulties when house hunting for an accessible home in Auckland.

In June, Auckland Council made a submission about the Building Act Reform supporting, among other things, provision for accessible housing.

The Minister for Disability Issues, Hon Carmel Sepuloni, invited panel members to meet with her on 10 July 2019. She demonstrated a real understanding of the size of the problem – just 2% of New Zealand private dwellings are accessible – and she spoke about the steps Government is taking to make more new houses accessible.

On 29 July 2019 there is a meeting of the governing body, demographic advisory panels and the Executive Leadership Team to discuss housing.

The panel genuinely appreciates the understanding council has shown about this issue, and acknowledges its efforts to support a significant increase in accessible housing.

Public transport

The panel raised its concerns with council on 21 March 2018 in its recommendations on the ten-year budget and 30-year plan. Specifically the panel recommended
• That, should a Regional Fuel Tax be introduced, council reviews with Auckland Transport the maximum fare subsidy of the Total Mobility Scheme, as taxi and other public transport fares are likely to increase as a result of the introduction of the RFT;
• That Council advocates for equitable access to subsidies and mobility parking permits.

At its meeting open to the public on 4 October 2018 the panel received an update from Auckland Transport which sparked a major exchange with the panel and members of the public present. For example, one deafblind member of the public related his experience of very unsatisfactory treatment by some train staff.

At the panel’s community forum on 13 October 2018 most of the feedback from attendees was about unsatisfactory public transport.

On 8 November 2018 Auckland Transport presented to a joint meeting of demographic advisory panels’ members and council’s Executive Leadership Team. We are not aware of any outcomes from this meeting.

The safety of disabled pedestrians, provoked by the introduction of e-scooters in October 2018, was discussed at the panel’s meeting open to the public on 18 March 2019. The panel resolved:
a) acknowledged that Auckland Council and Auckland Transport are exploring alternative modes of transport to move individuals quickly across short distances in Auckland, such as e-scooters.
b) acknowledged that Auckland Transport is taking steps to reduce speeds of vehicular traffic to improve safety for everyone on the roads.
c) recommended that Auckland Council and Auckland Transport will continue to work to maintain high standards of safety for all pedestrians on footpaths and road crossings, in particular those who have access needs and who may not see or hear e-scooters moving about or left lying down on footpaths.
d) recommended that Auckland Council consult with its demographic advisory panels and the wider Auckland disability community prior to making further decisions about e-scooters.

The panel’s June 2019 meeting received a presentation from council and Auckland Transport staff. The panel was pleased that this clearly showed concerns from the panel and the general public were reflected in new council guidelines for a trial to conclude in October 2019.

Community forums

The Panel held a very successful community forum on the North Shore in October 2018. Access to public transport and council facilities such as parks and swimming pools were among the matters raised. Although a report was written, resources were not available to distribute this to attendees or the wider community.

Another engaging community forum was held in South Auckland in July 2019. Attendees discussed public transport, accessible housing and employment.

Regional Facilities Auckland

The panel has made recommendations to RFA about ways to make its facilities more inclusive for disabled Aucklanders in response to two presentations from their staff.
However, physical limitations at a number of facilities are limiting attendance at public events by a number of wheelchair users.

Voter participation

The panel has supported staff who are striving to lift participation by all groups including disabled people in local body elections.

The panel supported Auckland Council efforts to introduce online voting in the 2019 local elections, in particular for disability communities, many of whose members experience difficulty casting their votes independently. Unfortunately there was insufficient funding for the trial to proceed.

At its meeting in May 2019 the panel received a presentation about work to engage with various communities, including organisations for the Deaf, blind and vision impaired. Recommendations were made on ways to support disabled people to consider standing for Council and Local Boards.

Other feedback opportunities

The panel has provided feedback on:
- Inclusive Auckland Framework.
- Investing in Aucklanders
- Tākaro – Investing in Play;
- Age Friendly Auckland; and
- Auckland Emergency Management plans and policies.

The panel has linked with the Seniors Panel to:
- urge City Rail Link to provide an accessible entrance to the Karangahape Road Station from Beresford Square; and
- request urgent repair of the Auckland Town Hall lift in the Civic Carpark.

Disability related achievements outside the panel’s work

Auckland Live continues to support NZSL and audio described events.

With support from Auckland Live, the Auckland Arts Festival has taken significant steps to make its events more accessible, reducing ticket prices and offering a telephone booking service in addition to its online service. In 2018 the Auckland Arts Festival organisers received the highest award from Arts Access Aotearoa. In 2019 the Auckland Arts Festival initiated the first audio described performance in Te Reo Māori, The Kuia and the Spider by Patricia Grace.

The panel is pleased to see the initiative of captioning of movies in parks.
Appendix 1:

Recommendations to incoming panel

Prepare your work programme which has to be approved by the governing body. Remind yourselves about it at each meeting with updates and achievements listed whenever they occur.

Monitor implementation of the Disability Operational Action Plan and provide advice to keep the plan on track. Seek a way to recognise success with disability projects by council staff, to show them the very positive difference their actions can make in the lives of disabled Aucklanders.

Review the issues that previous panels picked up and decide which ones you will continue to give advice about.

Consider developing links with local boards. Their activities affect disabled Aucklanders as much as those of council as a whole.

Seek feedback from council about the panel’s recommendations and how the panel’s feedback has been taken on board. Work with council to “close the loop”.

Discuss with council a communications strategy for the panel’s work that is broader than community forums and possible online engagement. How might the panel share its successes with the wider disabled community?

In your role as the two-way conduit between council and the disability community, prioritise the planning of community forums and online engagement, clearly identifying available staff and panel resources for organising this. What are the outcomes you seek and how will you communicate these to the disability community?

Consider the issue of access to information so that all may read council documents. Invoices such as council rates and Watercare Services bills as well as some surveys have historically been and continue to be inaccessible.

Recommend to council the names of appropriate organisations that could be invited to tender for exercises such as accessibility audits.
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Nau Mai, Haere
Mai, Kia Ora, 您好
Ni Hao, こんにちは
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Salibonani, Ni Sa Bula,
Namaste, नमस्ते, মাই
মো অস্তঃ, अजिज, 
สวัสดีค่ะ, วันสวัสดี,
안녕하세요, Buenos Días,
Ciao, Hola, Halo, Salam,
And Welcome!
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Introduction

Sunil Kaushal
Chairman

It has been an absolute privilege and honour to lead the Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel. The panel consists of eight passionate and diverse members representing various communities and ethnicities in Auckland, who have sought to make a difference on the future of Auckland.

From the early days, the panel identified six areas which mattered the most to the Ethnic communities in Auckland. You can read all about it in the report. The report is a strong reflection of the hard work the panel has put in this term to maintain a sense of transparency, engagement and advocacy on behalf of the ethnic communities in Tāmaki Makaurau.

During the current term, the panel have also engaged in a number of activities including: integrated panel sessions, developing and driving the panel’s work programme and presentations to the committees, engagement with Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs), engagement with external ethnic organisations, public forums, and council’s approach to community engagement.

I like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues Jade Tang-Taylor, Anita Keestro, Bill Gruen, Dave Tomu, Jessica Phuang, Ljubica Mamula-Seadon, Naoe Hashimoto for their contributions and insights into the various discussions and feedback we had during this term.

A special acknowledgement to the Councillors and council staff who tirelessly work behind the scenes and give their evenings to engage with the panel. Thank you to Councillor Cathy Casey (Chief Liaison Councillor), Councillor Alf Filipaina (Liaison Councillor), Lead officers Cecilia Tse and Shameel Sahib, Kareana Kee (Deputy Lead Officer), Carol Hayward (Principle Advisor) and Suad Allie (Governance Advisor). A special thank you to Austin Kim who was instrumental in guiding the panel before taking up another role in the council.

I like to leave with a thought from Margaret Mead, ‘Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has’.

Ngā Mihi

Sunil Kaushal
Chairman – Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel
Background

What is the panel?

The Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel (the panel) offers advice to Auckland Council, based on the panel members’ experiences living as people from ethnic cultures, to help the council improve outcomes for this community.

The members of the Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel for the current term are:

- Sunil Kaushal (chair)
- Jade Tang-Taylor (deputy chair)
- Anita Keestra
- Bill Guan
- Dave Tomu
- Jessica Phuang
- Ljubica Mamula-Seadon
- Naoe Hashimoto
- Councillor Alf Filipaina (liaison councillor)
- Councillor Cathy Casey (chief liaison councillor)
- Lead officers: Cecilia Tse, Shameel Sahib

The panel’s remit is to identify the issues that are important to people from ethnic cultures, provide advice on council regional strategies, policies and plans, and to help council to effectively engage with people from ethnic cultures.
Our current term

Inspired by Auckland population growth and ethnic diversity projections and the values promoted by the Auckland Plan 2050, the Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel has endeavoured in its current term (2017 – 2019) to engage with ethnic communities and highlight some of their stories and visions for the future of Auckland.

The panel has continued to provide advice and input to Auckland Council on matters that are of significance to ethnic communities including transport, housing, community safety, council by-laws and electoral participation. The panel’s community meetings have been very well attended and the panel will continue to use these as a source of seeking community engagement.

---

Projected population in four largest ethnic groups, Auckland, 2018 to 2038

Attachment B
Priorities for the panel

Since the induction of the current term in April 2017, the panel members have attended monthly panel meetings and discussed more than 30 agenda items. The panel has advised on a number of council agendas including: Auckland Plan 2050, 10-year budget, Investing in Aucklanders, Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw review, Auckland Council's engagement approach, Inclusive Auckland Framework (diversity strategy), Investing in Play, Voter participation, Emergency Management Plan and Facilities Network Policy.

The panel has also engaged in a number of activities including: integrated panel sessions, developing and driving the panel's work programme and presentations to the committees, engagement with Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs), engagement with external ethnic organisations, public forums, and council's approach to community engagement.

In September 2017, the Environment and Community Committee approved the priorities and work programme of the Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel. The key priorities include:

1. A safer Auckland for ethnic communities
2. The Inclusive Auckland Framework
3. Culturally competent council engagement
4. Affordable accommodations for new migrants
5. Effective public transport for migrants.
6. Increasing ethnic communities' civic participation
Achievements

A safer Auckland for ethnic communities

The panel advised on the Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw Review in May 2017, and on the Navigation and Safety bylaw in June 2019. The Panel also sought out the view and ideas for a safer Auckland through a community hui held in Henderson, West Auckland. The Henderson community meeting was very well attended and included representatives from the NZ Police, community leaders and local business leaders.

The Inclusive Auckland Framework

The council has developed a diversity and inclusion framework to guide council staff in working more inclusively and effectively with Auckland’s diverse populations. The panel has provided feedback on the framework and advice on council’s approach to working inclusively with diverse groups.

A Safer Auckland Hui – West Auckland

Integrated Panel Session
Culturally competent council engagement

Community forums and community engagement

The panel was encouraged to organise one or more community forums within an operating budget to engage with ethnic communities on council’s substantial issues or issues important to the communities. Activities have included attending the ANZ Migrant Expo in June 2018; the launch of the Future of Auckland storytelling project in April 2019; holding themed open meetings on the North Shore (Community Wellbeing); South Auckland (An ethnically engaged Auckland); West Auckland (Safety); a “Have Your Say” event on the Long-term Plan and Auckland Plan and co-hosting the Community Development and Safety committee meeting with special guest speakers Under-Secretary to the Minister for Ethnic Communities, Michael Wood and community leader Anjum Rahman.

Advice on Engagement approach

The panel advised on council’s engagement approach to ethnic communities to the Citizen Engagement and Insights unit, and on the review of the Auckland Council Engagement Guidelines. The final Engagement Performance Framework incorporated feedback from the panel with a strong focus on diversity and inclusion.

Affordable accommodations for new migrants

The panel advised on council’s policy approach to affordable housing and homelessness issues, including vulnerable groups. Panel members contributed to stakeholder workshops in August and September 2018. The panel also made recommendations for solutions to improve housing for ethnic communities for consideration in the 10-year budget and Auckland Plan.
Effective public transport for migrants

The panel contributed to combined recommendations from the Demographic Panels for the 10-year budget and Auckland Plan 2050 on transport and housing issues affecting ethnic communities. Recommendations included providing better, more reliable and more frequent transport services, investing in making transport services safer with better security, investing in more parking at transport hubs to encourage public versus private transport, considering more direct routes.

Increasing ethnic communities’ civic participation

Voter participation

The council’s democracy services team is aiming to improve diversity of candidates for the 2019 elections and to encourage participation among Auckland’s diverse population. A cross panel working group was established and met three times between October 2018 and June 2019. The panel aimed to encourage voter participation through their November 2018 open meeting and provided feedback on increasing civic participation for ethnic communities at the May 2019 public forum.

Auckland Plan Refresh

The panel offered feedback on the Auckland Plan Refresh process and provided advice on community groups and engagement channels and approach with the ethnic communities. The panel organised a ‘Have your say event’, and based the feedback received, the panel presented to the governing body with the panel’s views on the 10-year budget and the Auckland Plan Refresh in March 2018.
The Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel website has been developed and went live in June 2019. This is intended to provide a legacy for future panels to continue building community connections and understanding. The website introduces the panel, its members, explains how the panel works, and includes key programmes and combined recommendations of the demographic panels. The site also keeps members of the public informed of upcoming community events and meetings, to share resources to support ethnic diversity in the community and provide a mechanism for staying in touch with panel members and others in the community.

The panel launched this website to share ethnic community stories called The Future of Auckland. The campaign aims to engage with the hopes and dreams of Auckland’s ethnic communities as ethnic diversity is projected to rise significantly over the next 20 years.
Item 18

Future of Auckland Campaign, #FutureofAuckland
Visit: https://www.advisorypanels.nz/community-storytelling
Observations and learnings

The Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel's agreed set of six priorities provided focus for their work programme, however feedback has highlighted transport and housing as the two most important and pressing issues for the ethnic communities. The challenge however has been that these two issues need multi agency collaboration and has sometimes been frustrating for the panel as they may have felt that adequate progress has not been made.

The panel has created the Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel website as a legacy for future panels to continue building community connections and understanding. It also performs a vital role of encouraging ethnic participation by informing the community of the key events taking place such as public meetings.
Item 18

Register your interest in future
Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel terms:

ethnicpeoples.advisorypanel@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
INTRODUCTION

Since it was established in 2016, the Ngā Hui a te Rōpū Kaitohutohu Take Hapori Iwi Takatāpui / Rainbow Communities Advisory Panel has been effective in providing strategic advice to the Governing Body and also working with Council staff on incorporating Rainbow issues into key strategies and policies and supporting them to engage with Rainbow communities and work programmes to improve some of the challenges faced by Aucklanders who identify as LGBTTIQ+

Why have a Rainbow panel?

Auckland is a place where many key Rainbow communities and organisations thrive. For many seeking a place to belong, because of being Rainbow, it is their first contact with Rainbow society. Many Rainbow people living in more conservative areas of New Zealand move to Auckland.

While it is extremely hard to find any disaggregated statistics for Rainbow people, it is the commonly held view that, nationally, gay and lesbians are 10% of the population, transgender 1.2% and Intersex people 2%. As Auckland is such a magnet for so many Rainbow people, the local statistics could be much higher.

It is therefore essential that a Rainbow lens is placed over key decisions made by and advice given to the Auckland Council. There is, at the time of writing, one elected openly gay councillor. They cannot be expected to hold the sole lens even with the support of a number of salaried staff who identify with various Rainbow communities.

The current panel are:

- Julie Radford-Poupard (Co-Chair)
- John Kipti (Co-Chair)
- Aram Wu (relocated mid-term)
- Moira Clarke
- Mark Fisher
- Lesley Matheson ODNZM
- Julie Watson
- Diana Reynolds
- Bruce Wintter ANZM
- Audrey Hutchison
- Dave Hatt
- Councillor Richard Hills (Liaison Councillor)
- Councillor Cathy Casey (Chief Liaison Councillor)

Lead Officer(s): James Hassall and Judith Webster
Deputy Lead Officer: Liz Emon
Principal Advisor Panels: Austin Kinn and Carol Hayward

Democracy Advisors: Duncan Glasgow, Sandra Gordon, Michele Judge, Sonja Tomovska, Luca Gravavaci and Kalinda Gopal.

We are so grateful for the superb support, encouragement and guidance we were given over the term and previous partial term from Mike George and Catherine.

Having Councillors Richard Hills and Cathy Casey on our team meant we were able to achieve so much more than we might have been.
ACHIEVEMENTS

Auckland Rainbow Communities told us that safety, housing, transport, visibility and promotion of Auckland and activation of spaces, events and venues were key themes for what they dream for Auckland Rainbow Communities. The panel used these themes to help frame our work programme and priorities over the three-year term. Meetings with Auckland Council’s Governing Body and Executive Leadership Team focused on transport and housing issues.

The panel had three focuses and priority areas for the term.

1. A safer Auckland for Rainbow Communities
2. Affordable and secure housing
3. Rainbow-friendly spaces, events and venues


AFFORDABLE AND SECURE HOUSING

In the housing space the panel engaged with staff regarding the Homelessness Count. After meeting with the group managing this project (alongside other groups), they included questions in the survey which led them to finding Rainbow people were overrepresented among those living without shelter. This also resulted in RIMU undertaking a literature review on Rainbow homelessness relevant to Auckland.

Sexual identity information was provided by 49 survey participants. When asked to describe their sexual identity, 86% (42 people) identified as heterosexual/straight and 12% (seven people) with a rainbow sexual identity (gay, bisexual and Takatāre). Questions about sexual orientation were considered but not included in the 2018 Census (Statistics New Zealand, 2018b). However, comparing the data we do have (New Zealand Attitudes and Values Study), people living without shelter are twice as likely to identify with a rainbow sexual identity and were over-represented living without shelter. Auckland Council (2018) Ira Mata, Ira Tangata: Auckland’s Homeless Count report Point In Time Count, p.27.

Rainbow people face social stigma, discrimination and often rejection by their families, which adds to the physical and mental strains/challenges that all homeless persons must struggle with (Keuroghlian, Shitsel & Basuk, 2014; Cochrane, Stewart, Gender & Cauco, 2002). Additionally, rainbow people experience barriers to accessing homeless and health services which are safe, inclusive and responsive to their needs (Grant, et al. 2011; Morton, Samuels, Dworsky & Patel, 2018). (P27)
RAINBOW-FRIENDLY SPACES, EVENTS AND VENUES

We were represented in some way at each Big Gay Out, promoting the panel, the 3 questions and engaging with our communities.

The panel supported Auckland Pride in 2017 by facilitating funding meetings with council organisations and departments to enable the wider Auckland community to celebrate what had become an important annual event. Early in 2019 the panel worked with a range of interested parties including council’s own rainbow staff network with a view to finding a way through the challenges faced by the LGBTIQ community in relation to the Pride Parade.

A representative from the Rainbow Panel made a successful application for a grant from lotteries to undertake a business case for a Rainbow Hub/Pride centre.

We engaged with Council staff to provide advice on providing more Rainbow Public Art.

We held a public hui to support Rainbow community members to stand for governance roles within Auckland Council, including local body elections.

The panel invited several Rainbow sports teams to engage with Auckland Council Investing in Sports policy discussion.

MAKING AUCKLAND SAFER FOR RAINBOW COMMUNITIES

Getting all gender signage on some Council bathrooms and changing facilities, and an intention to prioritise this for new builds (we’re pushing for an official policy on this). There is also a scoping project now in place for public amenities.

Working with the Mayor to advocate to central government e.g. on the need for changes to the Human Rights Act to recognise gender identity and expression. This has involved letters to successive Ministers of Justice and a successful meeting with the Hon Andrew Little facilitated by Cr Richard Hills. The Advisory Panel remains active in this space.

The panel was influential in engaging with Mayor Goff, encouraging him to make a public statement about the internment and execution of LGBTIQ people in Chechnya. Mayor Goff issued the statement and it was picked up by the media.

We engaged with Auckland Transport to share the safety issues our communities face using public transport.

OTHER HIGHLIGHTS

Making sure Rainbow demographic questions are used in Council research including homelessness (see above example of city-wide homelessness survey) and encouraging council to include gender diverse as a sex category (now in many Auckland Council consultation documents). We have asked Council to think about how they collect data over a range of areas. Ideally there would be provision in every data collecting activity. Working with Council to establish as set of engagement guidelines that will enable departments to better connect with Rainbow Communities and to embed the idea that, whatever they do, we should be consulted.

We connected with the Rainbow Staff network of Auckland Council.

Rainbow community members met with the Mayor at a community hui to contribute to the Auckland Plan 2050 and 10 year budget.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations from the Outgoing Panel

- Recommend the implementation of Rainbow education for customer-facing council staff, for example, create “Rainbow Communities are welcome here” signage with Rainbow cultural competency training and checklist for all council facilities and ‘customer facing’ staff, i.e., an online 101 module like health and safety.
- Implement a policy for all existing and new council builds to have all gender single stall toilet and changing facilities.
- Implement a policy for collecting demographics of Rainbow Communities as a standard across all of Council.

General panel improvement recommendations

- Ensure the Rainbow panel continues and encourage all areas of the Council to engage them early on in any piece of work to assist with providing a rainbow lens.
- Provide a feedback loop for any advice given to Council to discuss outcomes or the need for ongoing work.
- Make the panel as representative as possible – missing from this panel were intersex people, Pacific Rainbow people, and unemployed people. We suggest holding places for secondments if necessary.
- Maintain the co-chair model, it has worked well.
Auckland Council Seniors Advisory Panel Report
2016 – 2019 Term

Ko au, Ko au, Ka Awatea
Light dawns, it is a new day

The route to Auckland Council seeking membership of the World Health Organisation’s (WHO’s) Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities

Age-friendly Auckland / Tāmaki Makaurau Project

This project aims to create an Auckland / Tāmaki Makaurau that’s a great place to grow older; where everyone feels they belong and can participate.

The inaugural (2014-2016) panel members were disappointed that their advocacy requesting our city join the World Health Organisation’s (WHO) Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities (WHO link) was not approved by the Governing Body. At the September 2016 meeting of the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee, the vote was tied, and the chair used his casting vote to oppose the recommendation. Instead, the council began work on the Investing in Aucklanders project.

A key goal of the current panel was to ask council to reconsider their September 2016 decision of declining to progress actions to join the WHO’s Global Network. Panel members highlighted that central government’s Ministry of Social Development (MSD) recognises how the life course perspectives embedded in creating Age-friendly Cities and Communities reflect the vision and priorities of Aotearoa New Zealand’s Positive Ageing Strategy (MSD Super Seniors link). Moreover, they noted that an Age-friendly Auckland / Tāmaki Makaurau would enable engagement opportunities to co-design safer environments with universal benefits for everyone.
On Friday 16 March 2018, the Seniors Advisory Panel held a community engagement forum in the Mount Eden War Memorial Hall, entitled Focus on the Future. The forum agenda referenced the WHO’s Age-friendly Cities and Communities’ Policy Framework to facilitate engagement with older Aucklanders, and solicited their responses to assist the panel formulate their feedback on the Auckland Plan and the Long-Term Plan. Attended by over 90 seniors representing more than 50 organisations from across the region, the forum invitations targeted a wide range of ethnicities and included seniors who seldom participate in council’s engagement activities. Head of Digital Solutions and Innovations at Auckland Libraries, Dr Greg Morgan (lead officer for the 2013-2016 term), acted as MC for the event, which included a line-up of speakers such as His Worship the Mayor, the Minister for Seniors, kaumātua, the Director of the Office for Seniors and futurist thinkers. Participants were challenged to consider visionary options when offering feedback about urban environments across the region that their children and grandchildren would be inheriting, and potentially also inhabiting.

Hon. Tracey Martin (Minister for Seniors), Mayor Phil Goff and Janet Clews (Seniors Advisory Panel Chairman) at the March 2018 forum.

Feedback from the March 2018 forum fed into the Long-term Plan and Auckland Plan consultation and was clustered around five priorities, which were incorporated into advice given to the joint Finance & Performance / Planning committees workshop:

1. Housing
2. Respect and social inclusion
3. Transport
4. Outdoor spaces and buildings; Social participation.

Whilst Housing and Transport were predominant concerns, social isolation and investment in services, facilities, and solutions which enable fairness and equity, social participation and inclusion were also dominant. The message from the forum clearly articulated that the focus should be as much on sustaining the wellbeing of our city’s residents, as on infrastructure.
WHO Age-friendly Policy Framework’s eight domains.

The panel’s report concluded that given the WHO Age-friendly policy framework facilitates the co-creation of inclusive community contexts which are beneficial for everyone, Auckland Council should become an Age-friendly City.

Looking for appropriate images to advertise the forum, the panel became aware of the lack of photographs depicting older citizens in the Auckland Council photo stock. As a result, a council photographer attended the community forum to capture the event, and offered the photos to Auckland Council. Six of those photos were subsequently accepted by The Wire for inclusion in the council’s photo stock, thus increasing the availability of photo stock reflecting the diversity of Auckland’s older citizens.

The panel also created a Seniors Community contacts master list, which was offered as a resource to Auckland Council. Auckland Council’s Age-friendly Project Team has used that master list to contact external stakeholders, when inviting them to participate in the Age-friendly community engagement events held around the region between April and July 2019.

David Wong-Hop (Deputy Chairman) and Mayor Phil Goff

Foreground: Panel members Sonny Niha, Mere Tunks and Mihi Te Huia
The Decision

On 10 July 2018, the Environment and Community Committee considered a report regarding Age-friendly Cities and resolved as follows:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) acknowledge and thank the Seniors Advisory Panel for their presentation regarding Auckland joining the World Health Organisation (WHO) Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities

b) agree Option 2: the council maintains existing approach and invests some resources to seek membership of the WHO Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities. Noting that all future implementation actions requiring financial decisions will be subject to Annual and Long-term Plan processes.

Advancing Auckland / Tāmaki Makaurau’s Age-friendly City Action Plan

Between 6-8 September 2018, Seniors Advisory Panel members attended the 2018 New Zealand Association of Gerontology’s (NZAG’s) The Mosaic of Ageing Conference, held at the Ellerslie Event Centre (NZAG link). The panel also secured sponsored exhibition space in the conference programme and at the venue.

In the light of the July 2018 decision that Auckland Council seek membership of the WHO’s Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities, the panel undertook a survey of NZAG Conference attendees. Respondents were asked to select the top three policy domains they thought were the most important to make Auckland / Tāmaki Makaurau more age-friendly. The results of 27 respondents’ preferences aligned with the March 2018 Forum feedback, in that transport, housing, and respect and social inclusion emerged as the top priorities. The survey results were shared with Auckland Council staff.

A Seniors Advisory Panel brochure was created to use at the 2018 NZAG conference, to introduce the panel members and explain the panel’s role and work programme priorities. This brochure has also been used as a communication tool for members, when attending events or talking to others in the community and has been appended to this report at Appendix A.

Panel members at the 2018 NZAG Mosaic of Ageing Conference.
On Monday 29 October 2018, the panel hosted a workshop for Seniors Advisory Panel representatives and Auckland Council staff, to learn from other agencies involved with Age-friendly city initiatives. External agencies attending included representatives from Hamilton City (the first city in Aotearoa NZ and 400th to join the WHO global network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities), the Office for Seniors, and the AUT Centre for Active Ageing Research.

In March 2019 the Seniors Advisory Panel co-hosted a meeting with the Community Development and Safety Committee that considered the theme A Smart Age-friendly Auckland. Speakers included: Sir Bob Harvey who referred to the health and wellbeing benefits throughout our lives of ‘forest bathing’ and connecting with our natural environments; whilst University of Auckland Professor Elizabeth Broadbent explored the increasing role of technology in aged care, and brought along Paro, a seal robot used for companionship and/or calming people living with dementia; and Dr Greg Morgan reported how Auckland Library staff are assisting the development of digital literacy, especially amongst older Aucklanders. The committee resolved to thank the Seniors Advisory Panel and presenters for their work in co-designing this session, and assisting the committee develop an understanding of the topic.

![Janet Clews discovered Paro the robotic seal's calming capabilities.](image)

**Auckland Council’s Age-Friendly Project Team (AFPT)**

Consulting with older residents to assemble an Age-friendly Action Plan for Auckland / Tāmaki Makaurau is an essential prerequisite to applying to join the WHO global network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities. As a result, an engagement strategy was devised by the council’s AFPT, and nine community engagement events planned, to be held across the region over a period of four months in mid-2019. The first of these events was held on 9 April 2019, in the Fickling Centre, with identified Age-friendly partners and stakeholders. Those attending trialled the devised engagement strategy, which was designed to elicit from attendees what community priorities should be included in Auckland Council’s Age-friendly Action Plan.
In essence, the agenda of that first consultation event included:

- discussing membership of the WHO’s Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities
- considering the AFPT’s proposed engagement approach to developing an Age-friendly action plan for the Auckland / Tamaki Makaurau region
- discussing key policy domains in the WHO’s Age-friendly policy framework (refer to the diagram on page 3), and possible actions associated with each domain for inclusion in the action plan
- considering how to support the AFPT’s engagement processes to develop a robust and relevant action plan for the Auckland region.

![The integrated panel Age-friendly Community Consultation held on 30 April 2019.](image)

Each community consultation event focused on one of the eight WHO Age-friendly policy domains, in addition to a ninth domain, Diversity and Inclusion, which was added to reflect the ethnic diversity of Tamaki Makaurau’s population. Panel members attended a number of the events, as champions for these community conversations; and the panel’s community forum budget was offered to support the costs associated with holding them.

On 13 June 2019 an Auckland Conversations event was held which focussed on Making Auckland an Age-friendly City and highlighted the need to accommodate and plan for future demographic changes in our region. This event undoubtedly captured the attention of a broader audience, because of the associated live video feed and website with an archival video repository, a WHO Age-friendly Cities and Communities link that provided contextual details, in addition to a link to a Have your Say Age-friendly digital survey that closed on 5 July (refer Auckland Conversations link and Have your Say link). Sir Bob Harvey led an informative panel discussion on the topic that included input from Janet Clews (Seniors Advisory Panel Chairman), Gloria Yaping Gao (Senior Manager, Social Services of the Chinese New Settlers Services Trust Foundation), Dr Elizabeth Broadbent (Professor of Health Psychology at The University of Auckland), Megan Tyler (Chief of Strategy, Auckland Council) and Glenn Wilcox (Deputy Chairman, Independent Māori Statutory Board). Questions directed to the panel from on-line viewers and those at the Crowne Plaza venue mainly focussed on transport issues.

The AFPT have reported back to the Seniors Advisory Panel during the panel’s regular cycle of meetings, to update and seek advice and guidance from members.
General

The panel’s Work Programme was shaped by the members’ shared vision for our city, which were identified in a workshop held at the start of this term.

Mere Tunks, Mihi Te Hula and Austin Kim during a panel workshop

The panel has provided advice and feedback throughout its term on over 30 pieces of work that both Auckland Council and outside organisations have sought (refer to the attached work programme in Appendix B for a full list). This advice was often incorporated into discussion documents. The bullet points below list examples which show the scope of advice and feedback the panel has provided during this term:

- worked with the Disability Advisory Panel to bring to Auckland Transport’s attention the difficulties some residents would experience using the proposed Karangahape Road/Mercury Lane entrance due to the steep incline;
- collaborated with the Access Alliance and supported their work with the Minister for Disabilities to draft new accessibility legislation;
- collaborated with the Disability Advisory Panel to draft a letter (co-signed by both panel’s chairs), addressed to Auckland Transport, requesting that they prioritise actions to ensure the lift access from the Civic Carpark to the Town Hall is fully functional during all hours that the Civic Carpark is open;
- provided insights into the prevalence of homelessness for seniors and asked to be involved in the development of the cross-sectoral homelessness strategy;
- advised Water Utility Consumer Assistance Trust to ensure the Citizens Advice Bureau is promoting the fund, and that communities understand it is funded by Watercare;
- assisted Volunteer Auckland with ideas about ways to encourage more people to volunteer;
- offered advice to Auckland Transport about keeping older people safe when using bus connections and transitions;
• supported the possibility of trialling access to free public transport, based on evidence from European cities such as Tallinn (Estonia) and Dunkirk (France), whilst remaining mindful that central government currently requires local government to meet 49% of the associated costs from fares (refer European Cities link). This was developed by panel member Roger Fowler, endorsed by the panel, presented to the Public Transport Accessibility Group (PTAG) and then to senior Auckland Transport staff;

• advised the community venue hire team on how to offer operations that meet the needs of seniors;

• Mere Tunks’ enquiry about the lack of visibility of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in the Council Chambers, resulted in a framed copy of Te Tiriti being installed in the corridor at the entrance to the main chamber in the Town Hall building;

![Mihi Te Hula, Judy Blakey and Mere Tunks examining the newly installed Te Tiriti o Waitangi.](image)

• offered advice on pensioner housing to the Haumaru joint venture between Auckland Council and the Selwyn Foundation (Haumaru Housing), and received a presentation on the way the company operates. As a community housing provider Haumaru builds and manages tenancies, and is not a health service provider;

• provided feedback on the City Centre Masterplan refresh document including; replacing the reference to ‘child-friendly’ with ‘age-friendly’; prioritising person-centred universal design and safety to accommodate the accessibility needs of people living with disabilities and limited mobility; referencing the work of council’s Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) in relation to innovation and promoting multicultural experiences; highlighting Auckland’s status as a UNESCO City of Music; and developing sustainability guidelines that limit the impact of cruise ship emissions, whilst exploring tourism opportunities for older tourists;

• Dr Judy Blakey provided more detail about the panel’s feedback on the City Centre Masterplan in person and introduced two Auckland University of Technology Centre for Active Ageing researchers who have published about the lived experiences of older residents in Auckland and other New Zealand city centres that are / are not age-friendly;

• expressed support for references in Auckland’s Climate Action Framework about youth and inter-generational equity, affirmed the utility of digital platforms for rangatahi to voice their views and suggested that their contributions could be enhanced with mentoring by seniors with relevant expertise in the subject area;
were represented on the cross-panel working party to explore digital election possibilities and ways to increase voter turnout, while noting that seniors are more likely to vote;

- worked with a council photographer on photo shoots to provide images for use in council and Auckland Transport's communications, in order to increase the visibility of older people;

- ensured that vulnerable older people's needs were included alongside those of children and pets in the council's draft Pathways to Preparedness Planning Framework for Recovery;

- accepted invitations to attend Grey Power meetings with Mayor Goff;

- 22-25 May 2019 Dr Judy Blakey attended the International Association of Gerontology and Geriatrics - European Region (2019 IAGG-ER) Congress in Gothenburg (Sweden) in her personal capacity, where she presented a poster that revealed Auckland / Tāmaki Makaurau’s emerging Age-friendly narrative within our unique Polynesian context.

The panel spoke to the joint Finance and Performance, and Planning Committees meeting held on 21 March 2018 in support of a targeted rate for clean water and harbours, as well as options to address Kauri dieback and other environmental protection. This supported the panel's work programme priority of “protecting our environment for future generations.”

Finale

The Seniors' Advisory Panel members appreciate the advice received from the Principal Advisor - Panels (Austin Kim, succeeded by Carol Hayward); the Lead Officer, (Allison Dobbie, succeeded by John Nash); and Deputy Lead Officer Cecily Dower, who has monitored the work programme and given practical support, sometimes outside of normal working hours. The panel's Democracy Services' governance advisors Luka Grbavac, Suad Allie and latterly, Sandra Gordon, have been approachable, supportive and patient. The panel is grateful to all these officers. Thanks also go to liaison councillors Linda Cooper who was succeeded by Daniel Newman; and the chief liaison councillor Dr Cathy Casey.

The opportunity afforded to the panels to meet with the Executive Leadership Team and the Governing Body brought a new dimension to the work of the demographic panels, as the interactions allowed for frank but respectful dialogue. This innovation demonstrated that the input from the panels was appreciated by both elected members and senior staff alike.

It is important to recognise the work of the Age-friendly Project team led by Rebecca Kruse, which has the mandate to progress the Age-friendly City concept, and to thank all those officers for their work to date. But there is still work to be done after the upcoming local body elections. Members accepted the invitation to continue to assist staff with the Age-friendly project following the panel's disestablishment. We hope the incoming council will continue to use the demographic panels as part of their community engagement interactions, and that the Seniors Advisory Panel will be involved in deciding upon the type of governance body to advance and monitor the Age-friendly City work programme.

The Seniors' Advisory Panel thanks Mayor Goff and the Governing Body for the opportunity to work with all these dedicated people to enhance the decision making process. We look forward to the future with growing confidence that the rising numbers of seniors will be catered for in a sensible, cost-effective and more enlightened way, which is well understood and embedded in council's principles and processes.

Attachments:
Appendix A (Seniors Advisory Panel brochure)
Appendix B (Panel’s Work Programme)
Seniors Advisory Panel members

- Janet Clews, CNZM, QSO (chair)
- David Wong Hop, MNZM (deputy chair)
- Dr Judy Blakey, MNZM
- Roger Fowler, QSM
- Joan Lardner-Rivlin, QSM
- Sonny Niha
- Mihi Te Huia
- Mere Tunks, QSM

Cr Daniel Newman - liaison councillor
daniel.newman@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Cr Cathy Casey – chief liaison councillor for the council’s six demographic advisory panels
cathy.casey@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Engaging with the Seniors Advisory Panel

Engaging with communities is an important part of the panel’s role. We encourage organisations and members of the public to get in touch with the panel or to attend our meetings.

If you want to contact or present to the panel, email seniorsadvisory.panel@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Recent topics considered by the panel include:
- The Auckland Plan 2050
- Universal design
- Civil defence and recovery
- Health and fitness
- Voter participation
Our role

The Seniors Advisory Panel offers advice based on their experiences living as seniors in Auckland. The panel provides strategic advice to Auckland Council and helps improve outcomes for seniors across the region.

Our role is to:

- identify the issues that are important to older people in Auckland
- provide feedback and advice on the council’s regional strategies, policies and plans, and any matter of particular interest or concern to older people.

Panel members are appointed every three years based on:

- lived experience and sound understanding of their communities
- understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi
- ability to think critically to offer high-level policy and strategic advice.

On the cover: Mihl Te Hula, Janet Clewes (chair), Joan Lardner-Rivlin, Roger Fowler, Mere Tunks, David Wong-Hop (deputy chair), Judy Blakey. Absent: Sonny Niha.

Our priorities

- Better public transport services and more accessible options for seniors
- Quality mixed housing and urban design
- More culturally diverse programmes
- More engaging recreational and community spaces and activities
- Protecting our environment for future generations

Auckland has committed to being an Age Friendly City, this means Auckland will become more inclusive, accessible and provide services for everyone, including seniors.

Community Forums

Panel member Sonny Niha with Sir Bob Harvey

We host community forums to understand community concerns, facilitate community discussion and advise the council. Our 2018 forum focused on the future and planning for an age friendly city.

Speakers included:

- Mayor Phil Goff
- Hon Tracey Martin, Minister for Seniors
- Diane Turner, Office for Seniors
- Sir Bob Harvey

The 2018 forum was attended by over 90 people from across the region, representing over 50 organisations. Participants identified housing, respect and social inclusion, transport, outdoor spaces and social participation as the top priorities for seniors in the region.
### SENIORS ADVISORY PANEL WORK PROGRAMME 2018-2019 (as at August 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority areas for the Seniors Advisory Panel:</th>
<th>The Seniors Advisory Panel:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- better public transport services and more accessible options for senior citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- quality mixed housing and urban design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- more culturally diverse programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- more engaging recreational and community spaces and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- protecting our environment for the next generations</td>
<td>- contributes to improving the outcomes for senior citizens and social cohesion as set out in the Auckland Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- advises on council's effective engagement with senior citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- is focused on regional issues that have a high impact, aligned with the forward work programme of the Environment &amp; Community Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Panel's Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Auckland Plan Refresh | The Auckland Plan Refresh updates the council's strategic direction for Auckland for the next 30 years. The current Auckland Plan was adopted in 2012. The plan is now being refreshed and will be clearer and more focused on the key issues. | - Panel members attended the Auckland Plan Refresh integrated panel sessions on 26 April 2017 to advise on Refresh process.  
- The panel offered additional feedback to the Auckland Plan team in the May workshop. Staff organised community workshops with the stakeholders recommended by the panel. Memo sent to all panels on 22 September updating on targeted engagement and strategic framework.  
- Long Term Plan and Auckland Plan formal consultation processes and documents ran at the same time in February/March 2018.  
- The chairperson attended 3 different sessions held on 3, 10 and 14 May 2018, to receive feedback and analysis from Auckland Plan Refresh consultation and to participate in discussion.  
- Panel's presented their feedback to the Joint F&P/Planning committee meeting on 21 March 2018.  
- The panels feedback during the early engagement phases provided valuable direction for the draft plan and its formal feedback during consultation, and input during the May 2018 workshops helped shape the final plan.  
- The Auckland Plan 2050 was adopted by the Planning Committee on 5 June 2018, setting the direction for how Auckland will grow and develop over the next 30 years. The final plan is the culmination of many months of work and extensive engagement with stakeholders and partners.  
- Panel members are invited to attend an event on 9 August 2018 to formally launch the Auckland Plan 2050. |
| Long-term Plan 2015-2028 | The Long-term Plan sets out the priorities and funding for council activities that are planned over a 10-year period. It includes financial and non-financial information for the council and council-controlled organisations. | - To advise on the needs and priorities of senior citizens  
- An integrated panel session was held on 30 October 2017. This feedback was incorporated into a presentation to the Finance and Performance Committee on 15 November.  
- The Mayoral Proposal was released on 29 November 2017. The Long-Term Plan and Auckland Plan formal consultation processes and documents ran at the same time in February/March 2018. The panels presented their feedback to F&P/Planning committee on 21 March 2018. Panel chair’s received feedback and analysis from LTP consultation on 9 May 2018.  
- The 10-year Long-Term Plan was approved at the Governing Body meeting held on 31 May 2018, which included the introduction of a Regional Fuel Tax. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Panel’s input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement approach</strong></td>
<td>The council is striving to achieve best community engagement processes and practices for engagement with senior citizens. The panel will assist the development of the council’s comprehensive stakeholder lists for senior citizens. The panel will provide advice related to council’s photo stock and the need to increase the range of images which reflect the diversity of Auckland’s older citizens.</td>
<td>• To offer feedback and advice to the Citizens and Engagement unit • To advise on the Auckland Council Engagement Guidelines for more effective engagement with senior citizens • The panel created a senior community contacts master list used to invite participants to the community forum – this was offered as a resource to Auckland Council. • An official photographer was invited to attend the Senior Advisor Panel Community event. 6 photos taken at the Community Forum have been accepted by The Wire for inclusion in the council’s photo stock • The panel attended and exhibited at The Mosaic of Ageing Conference held on 5-8 September 2018. 27 conference attendees participated in a survey run by the panel regarding Auckland becoming a more Age Friendly City. The results were shared with staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community forums</strong></td>
<td>The panel is entitled to organise one or more community forum(s) within an operating budget to engage with senior citizens on council’s substantial issues or issues important to the communities.</td>
<td>• To design the panel’s community forum(s) to bring senior citizens to discuss council issues and issues important to senior citizens. • A successful Community Forum was held on Friday 16 March 2018, themed Focus on the Future – The Journey to (Planning for) Age Friendly Communities. The panel received feedback from the forum participants which was included in the panel’s feedback to the Joint Finance and Performance Committee and Planning Committee held on 21 March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Takaro – Investing in Play</strong></td>
<td>The council seeks panel’s input to ensure that council’s investment in play is directed to where it can deliver the greatest value to the most people.</td>
<td>• Jacqueline Faamaturarau-Pounton presented Investing in Play; Takaro Consultation Project on 21 August 2017, Analysis will take place over the next 2 months • The advice from the Seniors Panel was incorporated into the consultation summary report, together with feedback from other demographic advisory panels. The report was presented to the Environment and Community Committee in February 2018. • The draft investment plan is currently in development. Indicative timeframes for publication and consultation on the draft is now August-September, with a view to having a final version adopted by December. • Mace Ward, Parks, Sports and Recreation, and Garth Dawson, Leisure Operations presented to the 19 November 2018 panel meeting regarding Play for older people/engagement with seniors on active recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investing in Aucklanders</strong></td>
<td>The Community and Social Policy Unit is starting a qualitative engagement process to elicit Aucklanders’ views on their lived experiences of inclusion and belonging, exclusion and social isolation. This work also focuses on barriers to participation and council’s role. The project will take a holistic approach to inclusion and will engage with a diverse range of population groups.</td>
<td>• To help shape the engagement process, contribute a diverse set of perspectives throughout the process, and provide advice on wider community engagement! • Further advisory panel engagement will be sought through several co-design phases and a summit in 2018. • On 25 September 2017, the panels attended an integrated panel session to advise on Investing in Aucklanders. Taena Abbey, Community Policy has completed a series of public engagement and consultation. Some panel members attended the stakeholder meeting held on 10 April 2018. • At the Environment and Community Committee held on 12 June 2019 approval was given to the start of up to five inclusion pilots to help Aucklanders feel an improved sense of belonging and participation. • Update The Innovation Unit - a social enterprise dedicated to improving social connectedness, last year completed a co-design discovery process called Generations. This work identified insights and opportunities relating to social inclusion and loneliness of older people. The insights gathered provide a solid foundation and pilot/prototyping setting for the next phase of the Investing in Aucklanders project. Council is working with the Innovation Unit to prototype and test possible solutions that make a difference to older people feeling included and socially connected. The Innovation Unit is taking a collective impact approach to this work involving other organisations such as Age Concern, AUT Centre for Active Ageing, Housing New Zealand Corporation and St John. The findings from this prototyping/pilot phase will be completed by November 2019. The findings, insights and ideas for action will be fed into the age-friendly action plan as well as the wider Investing in Aucklanders pilot programme. It is requested the findings are circulated to existing panel members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Council Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Panel’s Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing and urban design</td>
<td>To advise on council’s policy approach to mixed and affordable housing and homelessness issues, including urban and universal design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On 16 October the affordable housing policy team attended the Open Panel meeting. They would like to thank the Seniors panel for providing advice on the homelessness policy project and development of the regional, cross sectoral homelessness strategy. The team have commenced engagement with key stakeholders which includes government departments and service providers, along with advisory panels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This initial phase of engagement is to develop our understanding of where homelessness fits with the strategic priorities of government and other agencies. We are also exploring how these agencies would like to be involved in the development of the strategy, and their ideas about mechanisms for collaboration and oversight. Development of the strategy will commence early in 2018 centred around a methodology based on co-design and collective impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The affordable housing policy team will continue to update the Seniors Panel on progress and seek further input through this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An integrated panel event on housing will be held with the Executive Leadership Team and Governing Body on Monday 29 July 2018. The panel drew attention to the need for opportunities for integrated housing which can enhance the wellbeing of families and whanau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Auckland Framework</td>
<td>To advise on council’s approach to working inclusively with diverse groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deborah James, Head of Diversity and Inclusion, attended the Senior Advisory Panel meeting on 18 September 2017 to advise on council’s newly developed ‘Inclusive Auckland Framework’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On 17 May 2018, the panel chairs and deputy chairs had its first annual meeting with GB and ELT members. There were approx. 40 attendees including ten governing body members and six ELT members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An integrated session was held on 8 November with the theme of Auckland Transport. Shane Ellison, Chief Executive – Auckland Transport gave a presentation. Approximately 33 panel members, 8 Governing Body members, and around 8 members of the Auckland Council Executive Lead Team members attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A further integrated session was held on 30 November 2018 with the theme of Becoming a smart city and including a year-end celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council initiative</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport is a Council Controlled Organisation that delivers safe, innovative and sustainable transport for Auckland. The panel’s advice will focus on sustainable and accessible public transport that meets the needs of senior citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and open space</td>
<td>Council is responsible for managing many aspects of Auckland’s natural environment, including air and water quality, beaches, forests and open spaces, and waste management. The panel is aware of a generational responsibility to protect and improve the environment and open spaces for future generations, in particular by applying Te Ao Māori values and approaches. The panel contributes to environmental initiatives that improve public open spaces and protect our environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw Review</td>
<td>The council is reviewing the Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw. Main areas of the bylaw for panels’ advice include begging, car window washing and fireworks amongst many other issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council initiative</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland to consider becoming an Age Friendly City as part of the World Health Organisation’s Global Network.</td>
<td>The panel would like to encourage Auckland to become an Age Friendly City. At present the council is working on the Investing in Aucklanders’ project. The panel feels that becoming an Age Friendly City would not detract from this project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- nuisance and safety issues relating to drones be amended to specifically regulate the reckless use of drones  
- controls on set-netting be amended to increase transparency around decision-making for recreational fishing controls  
- the ban on setting off fireworks in public places be retained  
- issues are addressed in existing legislation and other bylaws where appropriate to make the bylaw easier to understand. |
<p>| Draft Strategy for an Ageing Population. | Auckland Council made a submission to the Office for Seniors - Ministry of Social Development on the draft ageing Strategy Better Later Life – He Oranga Kaumitua 2018 to 2034 | A drop-in session was held on Wednesday 22 May 2019 which was open to all elected members, Independent Māori Statutory Board members, and Advisory Panel members. This was an opportunity to provide feedback directly to staff on the council’s draft submission. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 18</th>
<th>Vice on council’s effective engagement with senior citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Facilities Auckland</td>
<td>17/7/17 – provided feedback on the ways that Regional Facilities Auckland can take account of the senior community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council’s Response to Homelessness</td>
<td>16/10/17 – provided insights into the prevalence of homelessness for seniors and asked to be involved in the development of the cross-sectoral homelessness strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Participation Initiative</td>
<td>20/11/17 – provided advice regarding their experience and barriers to participation for the 2016 Auckland local body elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Design Tool</td>
<td>19/2/18 – provided advice on the Universal Design Tool and advised Roger and Judy would alternate at the Universal Design Forum meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Utility Consumer Assistance Trust</td>
<td>19/2/18 – provided advice regarding the WUCAT to ensure CAB is promoting it and that communities understand it is funded by Watercare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Auckland</td>
<td>16/4/18 – provided advice to Cheryl on ways to encourage more people to volunteer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboursport</td>
<td>21/5/18 – provided advice regarding the livestronger website and programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Services</td>
<td>21/5/18 – provided advice regarding an expanded regional mobile library and access service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management – Disaster Recovery (DMR)</td>
<td>21/5/18 – provided advice regarding disaster recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Bus Network</td>
<td>18/6/18 – provided advice around safety regarding transitions and connections (lighting etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Climate Action Plan</td>
<td>16/7/18 – provided advice regarding the action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa Whai Whare Tatou: Regional, cross sectoral homelessness plan for Auckland</td>
<td>16/7/18 – provided feedback on the plan and agreed to attend the engagement event in August/September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Venue Hire</td>
<td>20/8/18 – Panel members requested further information on community venue hire, and provided advice on how council could more meet the needs of seniors in this space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw</td>
<td>20/8/18 – Council is reviewing the Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw and code of practice. Staff consulted with panel members regarding the bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>20/8/18 – Janet Clewes and Judy Blakey will be the representatives on the cross panel working group with Joan Lardner-Rivlin as backup, which met on 31/10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications – Insights and opportunities</td>
<td>17/9/18 – provided feedback and offered to utilise their networks for connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa Housing</td>
<td>15/10/18 – the panel asked questions and provided feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Timidated approach to welfare in emergencies</td>
<td>15/10/18 – Discussion re the assistance provided to Aucklanders following the April 2018 storm and the panel agreed to provide feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Legislation</td>
<td>19/11/18 – Panel recommended to CB (via Cr Newman) to requested central government to commit to enact national accessibility legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Auckland’s Signage Bylaw 2015</td>
<td>19/11/18 – provided advice on the bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport - Regional Public Transport Plan</td>
<td>19/11/18 – received a presentation and provided feedback. All feedback received from the public and other interest groups has since been analysed and used to help us inform the plan. The plan was approved by the AT Board at the 12 February Board and is now available at <a href="https://at.govt.nz/rtp">https://at.govt.nz/rtp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Advisory Panels Review</td>
<td>18/2/19 – provided feedback to RIMU staff regarding the Advisory Panel Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Masterplan</td>
<td>18/2/19 – provided feedback and suggested officers look at the age friendly city initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 September 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attachment B

**Item 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Council – Maori Library Services</th>
<th>18/3/19 – received a presentation</th>
<th>Judith Waaka, Maori Library 2018Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on increasing Aucklanders' participation in sport investment plan</td>
<td>18/3/19 – provided feedback on the draft plan. Judy provided detailed feedback around imagery</td>
<td>Ruth Woodward and Nancy Chu from Community and Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Emergency Management – current items of work</td>
<td>18/3/19 – provided feedback which suggested items to be included in the planning framework</td>
<td>David Murphy and Wayne Brown from Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur Water Future; A Discussion Document</td>
<td>18/3/19 – provided feedback on the discussion document</td>
<td>Andrew Chin and Wayne Brown from Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency co-ordination Centre</td>
<td>15/4/19 – the panel held their informal meeting at the emergency co-ordination centre. A tour and explanation of the centre was given.</td>
<td>Catherine Cooper, Head of Resilience and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and Inclusion – Council Controlled Organisations Board Initiative</td>
<td>15/4/19 – provided advice around how to improve the diversity of board members on Council Controlled Organisations. The Panel also provided feedback regarding the Inclusive Auckland Framework. A refresh of the document is planned for later in 2019, which will include reference to the Age Friendly Cities agenda as well as addressing other issues identified by the panel e.g. inconsistencies in Māori cultural references to Matariki.</td>
<td>Deborah James and Nathaniel Yalimaivai, Diversity and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections 2019 – Programme Update</td>
<td>20/5/19 – provided advice on additional events, ensuring a staff member who can speak to reo at events targeting Māori and expressing concern that young people are not educated regarding voting</td>
<td>Natalie Tropotova, Senior Advisor – Voter Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Safe Communities Accreditation</td>
<td>20/5/19 – suggested options to improve community taking up safety initiatives by including stakeholders such as Netsafe, Grey Power, Māori wardens, unions</td>
<td>Wayne Levick, Project Manager, Safe Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Safety Bylaw Review</td>
<td>17/6/19 – provided feedback regarding consuming alcohol on the water, SUP riders using life jackets, safety info should be provided in different languages and formats</td>
<td>Pania Elliot and Baylee Vyle, Community and Safety Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment for the new term</td>
<td>17/6/19 – provided feedback regarding the process for recruiting new panel members in the new term</td>
<td>Carol Haywood, Principal Advisor Panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport – Update on AT local trial</td>
<td>17/6/19 – received an overview on how the AT trial around Devonport, Bayswater and Stanley Point area is progressing</td>
<td>Peter Paton, Product Owner AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Centre Masterplan refresh</td>
<td>15/7/19 – provided advice regarding changing “child-friendly” to “age-friendly” as well as other relevant pieces of feedback</td>
<td>Cam Perkins and Philip le Quesne, Auckland Council CPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunui-te-Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Framework</td>
<td>15/7/19 – received a presentation</td>
<td>Dr Parin Raffel Thompson and Matthew Blakie, Chief Sustainability Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hutia te rito o te harakeke
Kei hea te kōmako?
Rere ki uta, rere ki tāi
Ki mai koe ki ahau ‘he aha te mea nui o te ao’?
Māku e ki atu
He tangata, he tangata, he tangata

If you cut the heart from the (harakeke) plant
Where will the bellbird sing?
It will fly inland, it will fly seawards
If you ask me ‘what is the most important thing in the world?’
My reply to you is - people, people, people!
(Metge & Jones, 1995)
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During this term, the Auckland Youth Advisory Panel was able to achieve its priorities of youth homelessness, environment and sustainability, transport and accessibility and civic participation and youth engagement. Alongside this, the Panel has made an effort to provide feedback on major plans and proposals that will shape Tāmaki Makaurau in the years to come. We have also made a conscious effort to engage with young people from across Tāmaki Makaurau to ensure that the panel is transparent with the work we are doing and acknowledging the amazing work done by other young people across the region. Therefore, it has been a privilege to follow in the footsteps of the previous Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson, Flora Apulu and Alex Johnston. The work the previous panels have done to advocate for youth voices in decision making helped set the foundation of this terms work programme.

Therefore, the Leadership team has had the absolute honour to lead 19 of our most talented young people from across Tāmaki Makaurau. The calibre of young people is a reflection of the work the Panel has been able to achieve in the past two and a half years.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank our liaison staff Mara Bebich (Youth Advisory panel Lead Officer), Amanda Kelly, (Deputy Lead Officer), Austin Kim (Demographic Panel Advisor) and Michelle Judge (Governance Advisor) for the valuable support they have given to the panel over this term. We would also like to thank Cr. Fa’anana Efeso Collins (Liaison Councillor for Youth Advisory Panel) and Cr. Cathy Casey (Liaison Demographic Advisor) for their continued endorsement of the work the panel does.

This report is a strong reflection of the hard work the panel has put in this term to maintain a sense of transparency, engagement and advocacy.
BACKGROUND

WHAT IS THE YOUTH ADVISORY PANEL?

The Auckland Youth Advisory Panel is one of six demographic panels established by Auckland Council. Our role is to advise the Mayor and his Councillors on strategic plans, policies, and documents through a youth lens. The panel is made up of 21 individuals, one individual selected from each local board area across Tamāki Makaurau and between the ages of 16-24. The panel serves a three-year term.

WHAT DOES THE PANEL DO?

At the beginning of our term, the panel created a work programme for the next three years. Out of that discussion, we came up with four priority areas. They are,

• Environment and sustainability
• Transport and accessibility
• Homelessness
• Youth engagement and civic participation

These priority areas determine how we operate, whom we speak to, and whom we ask to present at our Panel meetings.
WHAT IS THE I AM AUCKLAND STRATEGIC PLAN?

In 2013, the I Am Auckland plan was developed in partnership between Auckland Council and the Youth Advisory Panel. This plan is part of Council’s commitment to helping children and young people reach their full potential. This was under the direction of the previous Chair, Flora Apulu. The current Panel has aligned its current work program with the goals of this plan.

The plan has 7 goals. They are,
1. Voice: Children and young people have a voice, are valued and contribute.
2. Belonging: Children and young people are important, belong, are cared about, and feel safe.
3. Health and well-being: Children and young people are happy, healthy and thriving.
4. Fair go: Children and young people are given equal opportunities to succeed and have a fair go.
5. Connected: Children and young people can get around Auckland and get connected.
6. Opportunity: Children and young people feel that Auckland is their playground.
7. Whakapuawai: Rangatahi tū rangatira (all rangatahi will thrive).
WORK PROGRAM

HOMELESSNESS

The Panel has participated in different hui to try to understand the complexity around our most vulnerable rangatahi and where we fit into this picture. During our term, the Panel has joined and supported the Manaaki Rangatahi ki Tamaki Makaurau Collective, a collective of organisations that support young people that are or are soon to be homeless. We have also spoken with Auckland City Mission to really understand what our most vulnerable youth are facing and how we can support from an advocacy level. These discussions have helped inform our feedback into the Auckland Homelessness Action Plan.

TRANSPORT & ACCESSIBILITY

During our term, we have identified that the conditions of affordability, accessibility and safety on all modes of transport for young people can be improved. The Panel has voiced concerns on these issues on numerous occasions and has made an effort to see how we can be an agent for change. Some of the ways we have done this: We have written an open letter addressed to Auckland Transport (AT) that outline how young people need to have access to safe and affordable transport options to move throughout the city. The Panel has also participated in joint panel discussions with AT Executive staff that allowed us a space to share their opinions directly to the top of the chain of command.
ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY

The Panel has expressed an immense passion for exploring how the Auckland Council can be accountable for championing environmental issues. The Panel has questioned and responded to most of Auckland Council’s environment-related plans to make sure that young people are reflected in future planning. We have advocated strongly for the council to consider the sustainability and environmental protection of the Whenua for future generations to come. We have weaved these concerns through all of our feedback on environment-related plans.

CIVIC PARTICIPATION & ENGAGEMENT

All Panel members have expressed how important it is to actively engage and build relationships with young people in Auckland. Most of the Panel members have connected to local youth voice groups in order to amplify their conversations to a regional space. We have actively sought to connect with other youth-led organisations that are working on projects and have mahi that align with our key priorities such as the School Strike for Climate team, AUTSA, Auckland Youth Voice Network an UNYouth.
Ward Representation Review
The Youth Advisory Panel gave its feedback on the different proposals in the review that looked at Auckland Council’s ward and local board subdivision boundaries. It is a heavy piece of policy that was hard for our members to understand. A small working group met with the Policy Advisor and came to the conclusion that the review comes across to us as a process to meet number requirements, rather than reflect our communities’ interests. The panel’s feedback in relation to the proposal to split the Manukau Ward was strongly aligned to overwhelming public submissions against the split which resulted in this proposal not going ahead.

Regional, cross-sectoral homelessness plan for Auckland
Policy analyst Peter Chaudhry gave a presentation to provide background information on the development of the regional, cross-sectoral homelessness plan. This enabled the panel to understand the work the Auckland Council is doing for our vulnerable communities. We were able to provide informed feedback on how to include youth with relevant lived experiences in the development of this plan.

Auckland Climate Action Plan
The panel received a presentation with an update on the Auckland Climate Action Plan which looks at preparing Auckland for the effects of climate change. We provided feedback on the information around energy sources, and recycling in Tamaki Makaurau.

Open Letter to Auckland Transport
Earlier this year, the panel wrote an open letter discussing some concerns related to accessibility and the Regional Fuel Tax. Those concerns included clarity surrounding the RFT, and how long we can expect to be paying it, and the imminence of a fare increase.
Auckland’s Future Water Strategy
The Youth Advisory Panel is in support of the targeted issues that the Auckland Water Future strategy and concludes that an immediate response is necessary. The importance of the cleanliness of our drinking water and general recreation of our beaches, streams and rivers are key to the sustainability of our city. In addition, panel members recognise the importance of whakapapa and identity with water for Māori.

Southern Structure Proposal
The Youth Advisory Panel is in support of the targeted issues that the Auckland Water Future strategy and concludes that an immediate response is necessary. The importance of the cleanliness of our drinking water and general recreation of our beaches, streams and rivers are key to the sustainability of our city. In addition, panel members recognise the importance of whakapapa and identity with water for Māori.

Speed Limit Bylaw
Overall, the Youth Advisory Panel supported the proposed initiative to change the speed of our roads in order to increase public safety. With transport being a priority of the Panel, the safety of our roads are absolutely paramount.
A U C K L A N D  P L A N  
2 0 5 0

The Auckland Plan 2050 is the 30-year spatial plan that covers how Auckland Council plans to deal with Auckland's biggest issues. During the consultation period this year, the panel was very active in advocating for youth views to be reflected. Papakura representative Jacqueline Paul was commended for her contribution to the Auckland Plan. Her thoughts were included in the final document and were commended by Cr. Richard Hills at the launch of the Auckland Plan.

L O N G - T E R M  P L A N

The long-term plan outlines how the Auckland Council will invest its money over the next 10 years. The Youth Advisory Panel submitted its feedback and recommendations on the proposals. Our recommendations and feedback included: Concern for youth who have to drive and use public transport with regard to the fuel tax, accountability for how relevant agencies spend money raised through rates and concern around the accumulative cost of the multiple rates increases.
Highlights
We identified engagement as a focus area when we started. As a completely new team, it was important that we as a panel were able to advocate for all young people the best way possible. Here are a few ways we engaged.

Facebook Page
We have prioritised being more active on our social media to grow our presence in the community. We have done this by posting open meeting invitations and links for consultations and ongoing updates.

Online Profiles
The Panel has shared online profiles of all our members on Facebook. These profiles introduced ongoing engagement with panel member and the public.

Youth Voice Groups
Most of our members have connected with their local youth voice groups within their area, or are apart of other youth organisations. This helped with the accuracy of the feedback given to Auckland Council.

Organisations
In order to ensure that we are reaching every young person possible, we have made it a priority to make relationships with key organisations that work with and for young people. Organisations such as UNYouth and AUTSA provide the opportunity for the Auckland Youth Advisory Panel to tap into a wider audience that the panel does not reach on its own.
Para Kore Ki Tāmaki
Para Kore Ki Tamaki which aims to educate whanau about the effects and threats of plastic pollution, sustainable fisheries and revealing the truth behind consumer actions. The panel has been able to host them at our public meetings as well as communicate with the amazing group around the work they are doing with the Auckland Climate Action Plan.

Auckland School Strike 4 Climate
In 2019, there has been a lot of work done by our rangatahi in voicing their concerns around climate change and sustainability. The Auckland School Strike 4 Climate organisers were a group the panel was fortunate enough to host at their public meeting and engage with when it came to the Auckland Climate Action Plan Symposium to ensure that there is consistent collaboration within different channels of youth voices.

Auckland Youth Voice Network
The Auckland Youth Voice Network is a network of youth voice groups from across Auckland. We have maintained a relationship with the network by attending meetups hosted by different groups that bring the Network together to connect and discuss how we can support the work our organisations/groups are doing in our communities.
The Youth Advisory Panel recognises that a lack of youth voice in decision making has been a theme that many young people have expressed to the panel as something that is important. The panel has been able to support the kaupapa of Auckland Councils’ Elections team through forms of face-to-face engagement at Universities, as well as the series of online elections videos which aim to educate and encourage youth participation in this upcoming Local Body Elections.

University O-Week Celebrations
The Panel has supported Auckland Councils’ Elections Team and the Electoral Commission by working in collaboration at University stalls during O-Week. The University O-Week celebrations we attended were: AUT (North and City Campus), MIT (Manukau Campus) and UoA. This was an awesome opportunity for the panel members to engage with young people around the importance of enrolling to vote.

Election Videos
The Youth Advisory Panel alongside attending O-Week stalls has been able to help share a series of election videos that the Maori elections engagement team have produced with Activate, around educating young people on this local body elections.
PUB QUIZ

In 2018, we held a Pub Quiz. We identified that we often attract the same individuals when we engage with our communities. Our Pub Quiz was held in an effort to engage with people whom we don’t normally engage with. The way we integrated panel-related information was through an Auckland Civics category. Where we asked questions related to the Auckland Plan 2050, Long-Term Plan, I Am Auckland Strategic Plan and the Auckland Youth Advisory Panel. From this, we learned that information was not being shared adequately enough, and information that is being shared is too jargon-heavy.

END OF YEAR EVENT

The End of Year Event allowed the panel to share their work to-date. The panel was able to present the key priorities of the panel and the feedback they provided to plans in 2017-2018. The panel had an amazing turn out of 40 individuals from the community which included youth groups and voices, local board members and young people. The End of Year report was formulated and shared with those who attended and on Facebook via a digital format.
The Youth Advisory Panel Meetings have been used as a platform for young people who are leading change in Tamaki Makaurau to share their work with the Panel. It’s vital that these meetings are both empowering and educational for both parties. This has enabled the public to gain a better understanding of the key areas the panel is looking into for each priority. The Youth Advisory Panel Open Meetings have been a huge success with a large turnout of young people supporting their peers.

**April:** Auckland – School Strike 4 Climate team presented their work and their aspirations for the movement.

**June:** Howick Youth Council Presented to Auckland Youth Advisory Panel on T2 Bus Lane

**April/June:** Conscious Climate Mana Rangatahi Summit Parakore Ki Tamaki and Te Ohu Mana Rangatahi
The Youth Advisory Panel co-hosted the Community Development and Safety Committee meeting alongside Councillor Cathy Casey. This co-hosted meeting was an opportunity to discuss an issue of significant importance directly with Councillors and Executive staff from Auckland Council. The Panel used this opportunity to discuss the affordability, accessibility and safety of all modes of transport for young people in Auckland.

The Panel was able to invite some amazing presenters who were a mixture of academics, youth advocates and public servants. We were fortunate enough to have an Auckland Youth Advisory Panel member, Kramer Hoeflich who is also a passionate advocate for those of the disability community. Kramer was able to talk about the key issues around accessibility for our rangatahi who are using various forms of transport.
Auckland City Mission
For Youth Week 2018, the panel made trays of food that were donated to the Auckland City Mission. We wanted to donate food in celebration of their awesome kaupapa, gain an understanding of what advocacy we could offer, and learn about our most vulnerable rangatahi.

1,500 people annually. The Panel feels strongly about the importance of more youth employment

Youth Week 2019
The Auckland Youth Advisory Panel supported different local events across the region.

Job Fest 2018
Our Chair and Deputy Chair were invited to speak at the opening ceremony of the annual JobFest. JobFest is an event that brings employers, and students looking for employment together. JobFest is one of the only events of its kind and has over
Youth Homelessness Collective
The panel has been invited to work collaboratively alongside Lifewise and The Collective. The Collective is a group of representatives from different organisations who are working together to form actions against Youth Homelessness at a governance level. As a priority area for the panel, we felt compelled to get involved.

UNYouth Tertiary Policy Conference
Members of the panel were invited to be on a panel alongside Cr. Richard Hills to talk about the Auckland Plan 2050, and the big 6 proposals.

UNYouth - Aotearoa Youth Declaration
One of the themes for the Aotearoa Youth Declaration this year was local government.

So the panel hosted a session with the participants on the work the Youth Advisory Panel does and its role in Auckland Council.

Rangatahi Collaboration
Te Ohu Mana Rangatahi in collaboration with Auckland Council was able to provide the panel with the opportunity to participate in a collaborative workshop. This workshop helped to develop, lead and inform the rangatahi engagement strategy for the review of the Auckland Plan.

Child Youth and Well-Being Strategy
The panel was invited to take part in a workshop hosted by the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Education. This workshop focussed the outcome "All young people will be free from racism, stigma and discrimination" which is one of the sixteen outcomes.
There are some of our recommendations for the next Youth Advisory Panel:

**Be present and be consistent with your presence**
An integral part of being apart of this space is being present as much as possible. It is important to participate in as many hui, community forums, engagement sessions as possible to show your dedication to young people in decision-making discussions.

**Make use of all the opportunities Auckland Council offers**
It can feel overwhelming with the number of opportunities available, however, there’s a saying of ‘ask and you shall receive’; this is where you put that saying into action. Auckland Council has an array of networks that are waiting for young people to tap into and make impactful change in. You just have to ask.

**Bring others along on this journey with you**
Being apart of the Auckland Youth Advisory Panel, you have the opportunity to open doors for other young people who are creating impactful change in their community. The Auckland Youth Advisory Panel can provide a platform to share their work, either in a public meeting or through the endless networks you will develop as a panel. It’s important that we work in collaboration with other young people from across Tamaki Makaurau to make an impact as a collective of passionate young people in decision making.
CONCLUSION

Throughout the term, there have been an array of opportunities that all panel members have been able to gain valuable experience. During this process of personal development, the panel has had its fair share of learning to navigate the complicated world of Auckland Council, high-level strategic documents and ways to create impactful change on an advisory level. Many of the panel members joined the Auckland Youth Advisory Panel fresh out of High School and are near their end at University. And so, as we are nearing the end of our term; we are graduating Auckland Council.

It’s an odd feeling to have spent three years of your life with 19 other young people, however, it has been the most enriching experience to be able to see each panel member develop into their own person with passion and purpose in serving Tāmaki Makaurau. We are extremely proud of the work the panel has put in and hope to have ensured that young people feel included in discussions that are relevant to their present and future. We hope that during the panel’s term, we were able to achieve the priorities we’ve set as and have made an impact on young people, the demographic panels, Auckland Council and the development of Tāmaki Makaurau. As we reflect on this term, we are looking forward to seeing what the next round of panel members will achieve in elevating youth voices in decision making. Therefore, it is with our greatest honor to share this report of the Auckland Youth Advisory Panel for 2017-2019 term.

Ngā mihi nui
Chairperson Veisini Maka
Deputy Chairperson Damian Piilua
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THANK YOU FROM:

www.facebook.com/AKLYouthAdvisoryPanel
The Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel End of Term Report

Executive Summary
The Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel (PPAP) has focused its efforts on council priorities, major initiatives of the Auckland Plan, as well as systemic issues of importance to Pacific communities. The Panel has also continued to provide strategic advice, and support council events/activities for Pacific communities, including but not limited to Auckland’s annual Pasifika Festival.

Chair Acknowledgements:
The success of this term was due largely to the collective effort of many talented individuals and it would be remiss of me to not acknowledge and thank them for their significant contribution.

Firstly, to my fellow panel members, especially Deputy Chair Caroline (Ligi) Harris – thank you for your time, commitment and input. The discussions we’ve had over the term has been very insightful and practical, providing Council with useful feedback across an array of proposals, initiatives and policies.

Secondly, to our hard-working council algae; Our Principal Advisors Austin Kim succeeded by Carol Hayward, Our Lead Officers Louise Mason succeeded by Koro Dickinson, Our Deputy Lead Officer Nathaniel Yalimaiwai, Our Governance Advisors Luka Grbavac, Kalinda Gopal and Mike Giddey – thank you very much all for your time, wise counsel and commitment, usually going above and beyond what is expected.

To our Auckland Councillors – Chief Liaison Councillor Dr Cathy Casey, thank you for providing various opportunities to collaborate and for your continued support of our work programme objectives. Our Liaison Councillor Alf Filipaina, thank you for your leadership, guidance and commitment to always prioritise our meetings and events amongst your other community responsibilities.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge and thank my fellow Chairs of the other Demographic Panels; Janet Clews and David Wong-Hop (Seniors), Mary Schnackenberg and Dan Buckingham (Disability), Julie Radford-Poupar and John Kingi (Rainbow Communities), Sunil Kaushal and Jade Tang-Taylor (Ethnic), Veisinia Maka and Damien Pillua (Youth). Throughout this term we have worked together and supported each other on matters of common interest as many of our communities are the same.

The Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel
The Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel provided strategic advice on the needs of Pacific communities and strengthening Pacific voices in the council’s initiatives and activities. Panel members were supported by Liaison Councillor Cr Alf Filipaina. The current Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel members are:

- Leaupepe Ta’ala Ralph Elika (Chair)
- Caroline (Ligi) Harris (Deputy Chair)
- Sefita Hao’uli
- Jordan Kightley
• Afa’ese Manoa
• Fa’alavaau Helen Tau’au-Filisi

We would also like to acknowledge the significant contribution of the following Panel members who for various reasons resigned during the term but were still very active and committed to the PPAP objectives when they were part of the Panel:

• Tammy Kingi
• Taito Eddie Tuiavi'i
• Patrick Masina

**Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel Priorities:**

The PPAP designed its work programme based on Pacific peoples' views and priorities and how these aligned with the Auckland Plan. The panel’s work programme priorities were:

a. increasing civic participation/leadership of Pacific peoples within and outside the council
b. understand and positively influence Council initiatives that promote affordable quality housing and increased awareness of housing options available for the Pasifika community.
c. contribute to the council’s diversity and inclusion strategy
d. support the council’s health and well-being initiatives for Pasifika
e. advise on council policies and strategies for environment and sustainability
f. social issues including housing and community safety
g. arts and culture including traditional tattooing
h. economic development including opportunities for Pacific peoples and youth participation.

**Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel achievements**

The PPAP were heavily involved with a wide range of Council activities and initiatives. Where possible, panel members took a portfolio or formed sub-groups to directly engage with relevant staff for additional advice on specific issues outside their monthly fono (meetings) for example The Southern Initiative (TSI) and Auckland Plan dialogue.

Below is some of the PPAPs major achievements.

**Strategies, plans and policies**

1. The panel’s advice on council strategies and plans enabled council to better capture the voices of Pacific communities. Specifically, panel members’ views helped to inform the Auckland Plan and the Long-term Plan (LTP) 2018-2028. The PPAP supported the West and South Pasifika fonos on the LTP and Auckland Plan in 2018 by attending and supporting the facilitation.

2. In terms of policies and programmes, the PPAP provided advice to council on community, recreation, leisure, art and cultural services of interest to Pacific communities such as the Sports Investment Plan.

3. The panel offered advice on various bylaws, including the Health and Hygiene Bylaw. One of the bylaws dealt with tattooing and so the PPAP saw this as an opportunity to build relationships with the local boards out South. Therefore, the panel hosted a Health
and Hygiene Bylaw fono at Manukau Civic in conjunction with the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu and Ōtara - Papatoetoe Local boards. The purpose of the first fono was to share about the scope of the bylaw and the potential impacts on the traditional tattooing that was operating in Auckland as well as get the community’s feedback on the proposed amendments.

4. A second Fono was held out in the Mangere Community Arts Centre and this too was well attended and done in partnership with the local boards.

The Southern Initiative (TSI)

5. The panel offered ongoing advice on TSI programmes. Panel member Ligi Harris joined the TSI Steering Group to provide ongoing advice on the direction and approach of the TSI to Pacific communities.

Housing

6. Housing has been of significant interest to the panel as Pacific peoples are disproportionately affected by unaffordable housing, the under-supply of emergency housing and homelessness.

7. The Panel contributed regularly to forums where housing was discussed including the combined panel recommendations for the LTP and Auckland Plan focused on addressing Housing and Transport matters of concern to our communities.

8. In addition the Chair on behalf of the PPAP had opportunities to share Pasifika concerns around housing directly with the Mayor and other councillors at council meetings. The message was consistent and was a key point of advocacy for the PPAP.

9. The PPAP and council co-hosted a community debate on “Auckland – is it the best place for Pasifika to live?” in April 2019. The debate was well-attended by the public, live streamed to the community and generated constructive media commentary.

Empowered communities’ approach

10. The PPAP advocated and continued to encourage council to step-up its engagement and communication with Pacific communities through the empowered communities approach initiative. The PPAP’s views were reflected in the council’s Engagement Framework which was signed-off in December 2018.

11. The PPAP hosted a Youth Fono in May 2018 in Henderson to discuss employment pathways to council. Pasifika Staff from council’s cadet, internship and graduate programmes were present to share their experiences of working at council.
Inclusive Auckland

12. The PPAP provided constructive advice on the council’s diversity and inclusion framework to ensure the framework reflected a Pacific-world view (alongside other diverse and inclusive views). With the aim of having a positive impact on Pacific communities, for example enhancing the ‘belonging’ outcomes reflected in the Auckland Plan, as well as supporting the diversity and inclusion initiative to improve Pacific representation on council-controlled organisation boards.

Voter participation

13. The PPAP is keen to support and ensure council takes a proactive and effective approach to increasing voter turnout from Pacific communities (of all age brackets) in the upcoming 2019 local body elections.

14. This is reflected in the final public meeting for the PPAP which will focus on the coming elections and the importance of voting to determine our city leadership moving forward.

Community forums and events

15. Aside from the community forums and events already mentioned, the PPAP sought updates and gave regular advice to ATEED regarding the annual Pasifika Festival. This engagement was from 2017 – 2019.

Engagement and partnership with external partners

16. The panel partnered with central government and other external stakeholders to improve and empower government and community initiatives for Pacific peoples. This included:
   a. Endorsing the Auckland Council-Ministry for Pacific Peoples Memorandum of Understanding in May 2019. This had a specific focus on the diversity and inclusion initiative relating to appointments to CCO Boards
   b. Partnering with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade to facilitate a Pacific leaders roundtable discussion with the United Nations Secretary General Antonio Guterres in May 2019
   c. Engaging with the Pacific Media Network for community events to ensure that PPAP and Council initiatives are widely communicated through their various communication platforms to maximise community engagement.

Recommendations

Over this term we have learnt a few valuable lessons and would like to make the following recommendations for the next PPAP:

1. **Be committed and flexible to the demands of the role.** The three-year term outlines a monthly meeting for the panel but a lot of the work occurs outside of this with different engagements with Council and the community. The more visible the members are at these various engagements the more traction you gain when advocating for priorities that are important to the panel.

2. **Put yourself forward as a representative for the panel when the opportunity presents itself.** This is connected to commitment, but the key is that members can be
part of something they are passionate about and strategically this allows for efficient but effective panel involvement across different groups and subcommittees.

3. **Use the allocated panel funds to invest early in appropriate consultants and contractors that will allow you to focus on your core role and responsibilities.** An example for this term has been the partnership with the Pacific Media Network that has allowed the panel to focus on the delivery of key events without having to worry about community communications as they have the platforms and expertise to inform our community and get them involved.

4. **Turn up to meetings prepared.** This is obvious but is still a lesson that needs to be mentioned. When the information for the upcoming meetings is received please take the time to read and digest the information so that the meeting is ultimately more focused and productive from everyone involved.