



REGIONAL FORUM

People Water and Land – *Te Mana o te Tangata, te Wai, te Whenua*

RECORD OF WORKSHOP

Tuesday 28 and Wednesday 29 July 2020
Phase 3, Workshop 8 held at RSA, Riverton

Present

Mata Cherrington
David Diprose
Kelsi Hayes
Bernadette Hunt
Joyce Kolk
Jade Maguire
Paul Marshall
Phil Morrison (deputy chair)
Ewen Pirie

Lisa Pearson
Michelle Roberts
Hayden Slee
Fiona Smith (chair)

Apologies

Estelle Pera-Leask
Vaughan Templeton

Consensus was reached on:

1. It was agreed that the Chair and Deputy Chair would finalise the Regional Forums Phase Two Report and present it at a Council/Te Ao Marama Board workshop on 26 August. The report would then be submitted as an agenda item for the Strategy and Policy Committee on the 3 September 2020.

The group consensus aligned with the guidance laid out in Regional Forum Terms of Reference.

Other areas of discussion:

Dean Whaanga opened the workshop with a karakia and the chair, Fiona Smith led a discussion amongst the forum members as to their experiences through the COVID-19 lockdown and since the last workshop in person at Murihiku Marae in February.

The focus of the workshop was on

- Reconnecting and sharing reflections since February workshop
- Identify and explore the parameters of Regional Forums work in local sense including
 - policy context and regional settings;
 - environmental, cultural, economic and social features; and
 - practice ways of defining root causes of problems

Cnr North Road & Price St, Invercargill | Private Bag, Invercargill 9840 | 0800 76 88 45 | regionalforum@es.govt.nz | www.es.govt.nz

- Start developing criteria for assessment for choosing pathways
- Get a taster of scenario testing
- Hear from Aparima Community Environment Project and understand how the project relates to Regional Forums work

Regional Forum project update

Bonny Lawrence, People, Water and Land programme manager, outlined the approach for this phase of the forum's work. The next couple of workshops connect the work on the community values and objectives for freshwater and the beginning of testing of options and methods to meet these objectives. During lockdown work continued to bring together the community and iwi workstreams and develop draft freshwater objectives for Southland Murihiku. This work did however slow during this period due to the inability to meet in person and the complexity of the work. It is intended that the Southland Murihiku draft freshwater objectives will be brought together and shared by the end of 2020.

The workshops during the remainder of 2020 are focused on extending the thinking around possible actions, using lessons learned from national and international examples, and also emerging trends and tools. This workshop (Workshop 8) is the start of Phase Three, which will conclude in 2022.

At the end of Phase Two, the Regional Forum drafted a report to Council. This report will be provided to Governance ahead the Values and Objectives package so that the recommendations can be considered as part of the Long-term Plan deliberations. The report will include:

- A reflection of understanding of the community's values and objectives for freshwater to date.
- A reflection of understanding of the challenge for Southland based on the preliminary work on the current and future state of freshwater as defined by the draft freshwater objectives.
- Areas of focus for Phase Three
- Recommendations for immediate practical action

Bonny noted there is a session on Day 2 to review the draft text for the Phase Two report which was developed at previous workshops.

The space we work in – policy context and regional settings

Lauren Maciaszek, senior policy planner at Environment Southland, outlined the purpose of the session which was to set out the 'field of play' for the plan change that will come from the Regional Forum's work. This builds on work the forum have done at previous workshops.

She identified that the starting point for the policy scope and context is the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM), which sits under the umbrella of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The RMA provides the overarching direction under which a regional council functions but also provides for a series of policy documents which have been developed over time and provide more specific direction on particular topics.

She outlined the planning documents that are directly relevant under the RMA, and other legislation that is relevant to Council when making its decision on the plan change. This

session was provided to ensure that the forum is aware of the relevant documents and legislation. She outlined that as the forum moves ahead in their work and explores methods which could be implemented, the Kaititui (technical team) will provide detailed advice around the scope and direction in these higher order documents as needed, to ensure that the final package of advice that is consistent with the policy framework and is legally sound.

Following the presentation there was a good discussion around the interplay of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Generation.

The space we work in – characteristics of Southland

Emma Moran, senior policy analyst/economist at Environment Southland, took the forum through a session around the use of questioning to stimulate the critical thinking needed to develop advice around methods for Phase Three. The intent was to develop a clearer idea of Southland's characteristics (the environmental, cultural, economic and social features) and have practiced ways of defining root causes of problems.

The forum worked through two exercises. The first exercise was to identify some important characteristics about the Southland region that need to be considered in developing a targeted policy response. These characteristics will be social, cultural, economic and environmental but they are likely to all be connected in some way or another.

Two questions for the workshop exercise were asked:

- 1. What is it about Southland that determines its use of resources?; and*
- 2. What is it about Southland that influences the resilience (or sensitivity) of the environment to this resource use?*

The exercise was designed to spend some time thinking about what it is that shapes Southland as a first step in problem definition. Clearly defining an issue is the starting point for policy development and it will help inform the methods to be explored in Phase Three. The essential reading for this exercise was from the Southland Economic Project reports:

- Part A of The Agriculture and Forestry Report – pages 10 to 24 and pages 38 to 57.
- Part B of The Urban and Industry Report – pages 62 to 71.

The specific characteristics that the Regional Forum came up with included:

- Historical patterns of settlement – farming, forestry fisheries and foreigners
- Weather and climate- seasonality can intensify and constrain activities. Surviving winter well (not just agriculture – people and lifestyle as well). Constant/reliable rainfall.
- Intrinsic value of resources – exploitation
- A lot of resource – bountiful, abundant, accessible
- Productive soils (healthy/fertile)
- Seeing to improve/further develop over time – either for profit or development over multiple generations.
- Carrying capacity eg. Soil, water, townships
- Topography – plains/gently rolling land

- Easier transport
- Biophysical – southland is very diverse
- Balancing of climate/biophysical and activities eg tile drains
- Developed own methods for doing things – pragmatism, distance from other settlements
- Amenity – natural beauty and tourism
- Very reliant on primary industry
- Location – not on the way ‘to’ anywhere
- Proximity to power generation
- Education

A second exercise was designed to identify the root cause of a problem. With any issue there is always an urge to jump to the solution. However, that can lead to either a misdiagnosis or treatment of the symptoms without understanding the root causes. The next exercise follows the idea that a well-defined problem can contain its own solution.

Without over-complicating it, there are three basic steps to problem definition:

1. Describe the current situation
2. State the problem that needs solving
3. Ask why solving that issue is a problem

If the answer to step 3 is another problem then there is a shift from a symptom towards a deeper problem, and eventually a root cause. In the workshop the members tried out Toyota’s ‘five why’s’ technique, which explores cause and effect relationships underlying problems.

An example of a problem is: The vehicle will not start.

1. Why? – The battery is dead.
2. Why? – The alternator is not functioning.
3. Why? – The alternator belt has broken.
4. Why? – The alternator belt was well beyond its useful service life and not replaced.
5. Why? – The vehicle was not maintained according to the recommended service schedule.

The forum explored various issues or situations in Southland such as sediment in estuaries, loss of biodiversity, unsafe water recreation in some places, excessive algae in rivers and applied the 5 ‘Why’s’ to each statement. This drew out ideas and underlying assumptions.

Community Engagement Plan

Adrienne Henderson, senior communications coordinator at Environment Southland and forum deputy chair Phil Morrison spent time with the Regional Forum thinking about the forums role in community engagement and a communications strategy for the forum. The Regional Council is responsible for communication and engagement on the forums work (as set out in the Terms of Reference) however there is a role for the forum members to support, where appropriate, this engagement and communication.

A communications strategy will be further developed by Adrienne and Phil. Key points from the discussion:

- There is potential for people to challenge the legitimacy/integrity of the recommendations (by challenging the people, process, or science feeding into to).
- Strategy to make sure that people can contribute/share along the way so that they don't feel left out of the process – engage with all stakeholders.
- Key message to get out is that change is needed and it's going to take all of us.
- Forum would like to have feedback from stakeholders and community on draft assessment criteria before end of October.

The forum members discussed groups/stakeholders who we should be engaging with during the process. They discussed those who would take a more passive role (they should be aware, but have little interest in participating) and those who have a more active role (those who may have a high level of interest and influence on the process, or the impact may be high).

They also discussed key messaging for promoting the integrity and legitimacy of the forum. Forum members noted:

- They exercise individual intellectual sovereignty, and promote individual and collective critical reflection.
- They keep each other honest.
- They take our responsibility to balance the issues very seriously.
- They seek balanced and critical consideration of as many perspectives as possible.
- The Regional Forum membership reflects the robust Environment Southland selection process.
- They are all community members – they have access to and reflect a wide range of views in the community.

Field trip – Aparima Community and Environment (ACE) project

The forum members viewed Jacobs River Estuary from Bath St and then visited John White's farm. At the estuary they were joined by Robin Campbell (independent chair of ACE) who provided some detail on the origin, the rationale, and the aspirations (pathways) of the ACE project. At John White's farm, John gave an overview of some on-the-ground actions including his calving pad and winter grazing practice. Robin, John and Simon Hopcroft provided information on how the ACE project is functioning, what has worked well and what have been the challenges. They talked about the overall goal(s) of the project and the pathway to get there.

The forum recognised the mind set shift in the last 13 years as originally wintering was to just get animals through winter and now it has a strong environmental and animal welfare focus. The forum also recognised the considerable debt on farms and the investment required to improve (environmental and animal health) standards. The forum appreciated hearing about the steps to look at the whole catchment and join up conversations and initiatives up and down the catchment. They would like to follow the progress of the project.

Public session (4.30-6.30pm Tuesday 28 July)

The public session was opened by Fiona Smith. Barbara Nicholas facilitated the session, and forum members were spread out across the working tables so they could engage in discussion with the 60 public members who attended.

The first question asked was, 'For a child aged 5 now, when they're 25 and are (back) in Southland, what do we want the water to look like for them?' Each table had the opportunity to report their most popular responses back to the wider group. Here are the responses:

- Same or better water quality
- Riparian planting
- Swimmable rivers
- Whitebait and food production – better catches and bigger fish.
- Eels and lamprey – indigenous species flourishing
- Estuaries – sustainable kaimoana, and safe to eat. Estuaries are naturally flushing
- Water quantity – enough water in the waterways
- Reduced sediment load
- Reduced periphyton and cyanobacteria
- Water storage infrastructure – control sediment, and use stored water for irrigation
- Thriving businesses and communities
- Recreational opportunities, swimming and boating
- Free of rubbish and plastics – make sure that the environment as a whole is looked after
- More education about the natural environment, because people can't change what they don't know.
- Water seen as part of the landscape rather than just a resource to be used.
- Visual evidence of efforts to protect water (fencing, planting), less algae
- Better understanding of water quality.
- Less ducks and more other species flourishing.
- Whole community efforts to protect waterways

A second question was asked 'What is the pathway to get to the results in the list above?' Again the responses from each table were shared with the group. Here are the responses:

- Open season on ducks! And trout
- Keep measuring and focussed on science
- Reward the trendsetters/early adopters, so they're not penalised by having to re-do anything
- Everyone needs to be part of the solution (involvement/contribution)
- Funding priorities and tax incentives
- Education system and learning about the impacts of their lifestyle on the environment from a young age
- Values shift - a simpler life, scaling back expectations of needs and wants
- Water being a living being – like the recognition for the Whanganui River
- Looking for solutions that have worked in other countries
- Going to the heart of the story and make sure it's the right story that we're telling
- How do we define 'sustainable' and is it the right definition?
- Partnerships with local government – schools planting, going on farms, education and incentives. Interagency co-operation
- Conservation of species

- Environmental capital - % of land in native bush, wetland, infrastructure (eg. for effluent)
- Property rating system based on environmental impact
- Collaborative catchment groups – top to bottom of catchment
- Sense of fairness – although not equal, it's fair (farmers but also urban communities contributing) – WQ issues not solely rural
- Easier to imagine what it should be like in 20 years than it is to think about how to get there.
- Catchment approaches – eg. catchments purchasing a property to retire.
- No discharge of sewerage to water
- Native plantings – ugly gullies and gorse-ridden hillsides, but make sure we've got predator control in place as well
- Key focus on education, regenerative thinking
- Thinking about hydrological cycle as a whole
- Being prepared to experiment to find results
- Understand return on investment from interventions (environmentally?)
- Could be more at risk post-Covid when it comes to making investments
- Community engagement seems unequal – how do we get the urban community as engaged?
- How do we engender courage in our councillors, where they might not be prepared to make tough decisions? Need a willingness to make tough calls, including district/city councils with their water infrastructure
- Economies at household level and then building up, rather than top down
- Greywater systems, sewage processing contributions when developing new urban land
- Bipartisan agreement from central government

A third question was asked, 'What would be fair for Southland in the decisions that have to be made? What should the forum be considering when they're making their recommendations?' The responses were:

- Should we make the effort now, or put the cost/burden on the next generation?
- Can we use fewer resources than we currently are, but get more output?
- Do we need to have a more diverse financial base?
- Sometimes fair is not equal
- We have an abundance of water in Southland, and we have a much quicker time period for groundwater to reach surface water
- Te Mana o Wai
- Family-orientated opportunities – culture with sports, music, arts, education for all ages
- Soft rules and hard rules
- Conversation around challenges being faced by Southland at the moment.
- Food sovereignty – making use of the land and diversifying that use. Producing food, both in the backyard and the wider community
- Building the village and marae-based knowledge, and then extending that outwards.
- Tension between private ownership and restrictions being imposed by council/govt.
- Need to make sure we enable FMU-centric feedback to communities re the state of the environment.

- Be prepared to differentiate solutions by FMU.
- Social equity – is it fair to require that farms reduce losses, when we can't quantify what's needed at farm level?
- Less about paperwork and more about doing.
- Needs to enable experimentation
- Regulations forming bottom lines, with encouragement above that.
- Recognise variation within Southland
- Affordability
- Based on appropriate timeframes
- Needs to be cost-benefit – can't go chasing every rainbow

There were some questions after the round table exercise about the collection of values from the community, how this was undertaken, the Regional Forum's role and the forum's report to Council. Fiona Smith, Rachael Millar and Bonny Lawrence responded that Environment Southland and Te Ao Marama have led the values collection process and ongoing development of draft freshwater objectives (which have been delayed due to the complexity of the task and also COVID-19). The forum have been kept informed of this work.

The forum has prepared a report that reflects its journey over the past 16 months, what it has heard about the values of the community and iwi, what it has heard about the nature of the challenge. The forum also puts forward some initial recommendations to Council and Te Ao Marama in the report to support on-the-ground action and provide information for future decision-making. These are put forward so they can be considered as part of the Long-term Plan process. The report will be available in September. The forum is providing input to a communications plan led by Environment Southland and welcomes feedback as to how information could be communicated better.

Forum chair Fiona Smith closed the session by thanking all those for coming out, and encouraging everyone to keep engaged with the work of the forum. She commented that the team want to hear their concerns, so people should feel free to get in touch at any time.

Assessment criteria for choosing a pathway

Emma Moran (senior policy advisor/economist) led a session on developing criteria to assess options to meet the Southland Murihiku freshwater objectives. She outlined that in developing its advice on how to manage freshwater, the Regional Forum will use certain criteria – some of which are already established, either by law or through practice, and others that the Regional Forum may identify itself. These criteria will be used to assess the value of actions themselves and the methods (regulatory and non-regulatory) for delivering these actions. In doing so, the Regional Forum will be laying down a strong foundation for its advice from which to build on.

She explained that in general terms, the assessment criteria fall into two groups: those required by law (i.e. compulsory) and those established through existing practice (discretionary). As part of a process to promote sustainable resource management in Southland Murihiku¹, the Regional Forum is legally required to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Also essential are the philosophies of Te Mana o Te Wai and ki uta ki tai. These criteria are consistent with the Regional Forums draft vision statement and are currently being explored with the Regional Forum.

In addition, there are other legal requirements, under Section 32 of the Resource Management Act, to consider the effectiveness and efficiency of different options, and the

¹ Under Section 8 *Treaty of Waitangi* of the Resource Management Act 1991.

risks of acting or not acting because of uncertainty or insufficient information. These criteria relate to how well the Regional Forum’s final recommendations achieve the policy expectations for fresh water management in New Zealand. As well, there is now a clear expectation to consider the effects of climate change.

The Ministry for the Environment has described effectiveness and efficiency as follows²:

Effectiveness assesses the contribution a policy proposal makes towards achieving the objective, and how successful they are likely to be in solving the problem they were designed to address.

Efficiency measures whether a policy proposal will be likely to achieve the objectives at the lowest total cost to all members of society, or achieves the highest net benefit to all of society. The assessment of efficiency under the RMA involves the inclusion of a broad range of costs and benefits, many intangible and non-monetary.

A short technical explanation of efficiency (and a real life analogy) was discussed.

Other criteria established through existing practice were highlighted, such as equity, certainty and achievability, have been used by (in no particular order): the Water and Land Forum and Beef + Lamb New Zealand; and similar processes to the Regional Forum in Rotorua Lakes catchment in the Bay of Plenty, the Waikato-Waipā catchment in Waikato, the Hurunui catchment in Canterbury.

A summary of the the common types of criteria and in-depth discussion is available in the **Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research (2019) report: *Review of allocation methods to control contaminant loads from land***. The abridged version of this report was included in pre-reading and the full version was provided in hard copy at the Riverton workshop.

A summary of common types of criteria are:

Criteria required by law (compulsory)	Criteria established through practice (discretionary)
Iwi rights and interests	Promote fairness and/or equity
Te Mana o te Wai	Ease of governance / achievability (including simplicity)
Ki uta ki tai and integrated management	Flexibility for resource users
Efficiency in achieving freshwater objectives and plan objectives (technical/productive, allocative, dynamic)	Improve certainty for future investment
Effectiveness in achieving freshwater objectives and plan objectives	Treat resource users consistently
Risks of acting or not acting because of uncertainty or insufficient information	Recognise existing investment (including good management practices)
The effects of climate change	Promote more efficient resource use

² Ministry for the Environment (2017) *A Guide to Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991*.

Emma tied COVID-19 responses to the risks of acting vs not acting when there is uncertainty. We're here today because NZ acted, and the costs of acting can sometimes be less than not acting or acting later.

Ned Norton explained uncertainty by outlining that:

- Uncertainty is inevitable and there is no escape
- Weighing relative uncertainties is a legitimate process
- Accepting uncertainty creates risk – e.g. methods may or may not work as well as we think they will

He outlined that the technical team will to predict how far each method will get in relation to reaching the draft Southland Murihiku freshwater objectives, and be as transparent as possible around the certainty of those predictions (use language like 'very likely, very unlikely' etc).

The forum discussed if there were other criteria that it should consider to reflect local circumstances. They did an exercise looking at equity and came up with the following ideas for consideration:

- Trade-offs
- Fairness
- Scale – balance in the long term to recognise people spending more over a longer time
- Different users don't necessarily have equal rights
- Difference between water use to sustain life and water use to make profit. Same with whitebait stands/huts (eg. longdrops vs septic tanks) – it's the commercial whitebaiters that can put septic tanks in but not the recreational whitebaiters.
- Proportionality – what's realistic within peoples' means
- Social equity – historically, it was the second sons that came to NZ in the 1800's and that was their attempt at equity at the time.
- Emma noted that they don't have to include Equity as a principle.
- Helpful to specify that it's social equity
- Recognise investments made by existing users
- Nothing in life is fair – easier to cope when you recognise that, rather than trying to make it fair
- We should consider equity for the methods to stand the test of time.
- Recognising that not everyone is starting on the same starting line – need to target those starting behind.
- Good behaviour – recognising that people have got on with the job, and considering whether they would be penalised/rewarded for good behaviour.

Emma outlined that the forum will do further work on this between now and the next online workshop which is 9 September 2020. All agreed that the draft criteria should be socialised with the community and stakeholders for feedback. It is intended that this would happen in late September/October.

Taste of scenarios

Emma Moran led a session on testing 'what if' scenarios to better understand their implications for local communities and explained that it can quickly get quite complicated.

The purpose of this session was to introduce the topic, which is a core part of Phase Three of the Regional Forum, and it will be built on in subsequent workshops.

In 2019 Environment Southland completed some scenario work³ on the Government's Action for Healthy Waterways Package (part of the Essential Freshwater Programme). The work for Southland covered stock exclusion, farm management plans, and a nitrogen cap for some catchments. In the workshop the forum discussed stock exclusion, and specifically a set of scenarios that was developed to test various riparian buffers widths. The relevant chapter is Chapter 6 in the linked report: <https://www.lgnz.co.nz/assets/bcbc3efa29/RSWS-Advisory-Report-10-September-2019.pdf>

It was highlighted that all scenarios have certain elements, like location (where is it occurring?), who (will it apply to everyone, or specific users?), and how (what are the methods?). Scenarios are about building knowledge rather than looking for 'right' result and a fundamental point to scenario testing is to identify perverse outcomes.

The main points that the session covered were:

1. What is a 'what if' scenario exactly? (the group imagined some everyday examples);
2. The process from science, to policy, to impacts (i.e. it is not science itself that has impacts but the policy response to science);
3. The interpretation (or translation) that needs to occur to develop a scenario (i.e. it is just the intent of a policy option that is modelled, not the detail); and
4. The aim isn't to come up with a magic number – it is to get a better understanding of how Southland works – so it is useful to test variations on a theme; and
5. Modelling is helpful but it isn't the whole story – and results always need explanation and context.

The role of additional information such as mitigation options was discussed. Karl Erikson, principal land sustainability officer at Environment Southland, is putting together a list of mitigation options and will circulate his draft to the forum members. The list is being compiled with the help of external organisations and industry groups.

Over the next few months there is an opportunity to use the Southland Economic Model to run some trials with ideas the forum have whilst the technical work to complete the draft Southland Murihiku freshwater objectives is completed. With this in mind, Emma asked the forum to think about what they would like to test and respond by 9 September.

Regional Forum's report on Phase Two

Bonny Lawrence provided an overview of process so far to develop the Regional Forum's Report on Phase Two. The report has been drafted over several workshops for the purpose of:

- reviewing the first year of work by the Regional Forum;
- providing a commentary on the Southland Murihiku collective values and draft freshwater objectives and the challenge ahead;

³ This work was completed by Environment Southland and Waikato Regional Council on behalf of the Regional Sector for Local Government New Zealand. It was followed up by a more in-depth report that was attached to the Regional Sector's submission. This second report is also likely to be used as a reference at some point.

- making prioritised recommendations for immediate practical actions to improve water quality and/or help inform the decisions ahead.

The report was intended to accompany the Values and Objectives package which comprises: the Southland Murihiku values; the draft freshwater objectives; and the gap between the current state of our waterbodies and the draft freshwater objectives. However the package has been delayed due to the inability to meet in person and the complexity of the work. The package will be finalised and shared with the community later in 2020.

The forum discussed the delay and agreed that there is a pressing opportunity to get some work underway through Environment Southland's current Long-term Plan process and funding cycle to improve our water and/or help inform the decisions ahead. The forum members decided to proceed with finalising the report to governance, noting that it will reflect the preliminary work completed on the draft freshwater objectives and gap analysis, so that the recommendations for immediate action could be considered as part of the Long-term Plan process.

Field trip – Templeton Flax Mill Heritage Museum

At the conclusion of Day 2, the forum members joined Environment Southland Councillors and Te Ao Marama board members at the Templeton Flax Mill Heritage Museum. The museum showcases 1860s to 1970s flax processing technology, in particular flax milling in Southland. It still has an operational stripper and scutcher and provided the forum and visitors with a really valuable insight into this once significant industry in Southland. The forum and visitors also viewed some lagoon enhancement work on the property.

Key messages from the Regional Forum members

- This workshop was a great opportunity for us to reconnect as we haven't been able to meet face-to-face since February.
- Visiting Riverton gave us with the chance to learn more about the unique Aparima Community and Environment project and hear from some of the passionate farmers involved. It was great to see the positive and proactive steps these farmers are taking to improve their practice and ultimately water quality in the catchment.
- We were also able to hear from around 60 Aparima residents at the public session which focused on destinations and pathways. Forum members will be keen to hear about the changes participants thought were necessary to deliver on the community's aspirations for water, and what initiatives or requirements will make the difference.
- As part of the workshop, we learned more about the policy context and regional setting for our work and the recommendations we're going to be making.
- We discussed how we would assess our recommendations – ensuring they were fair, equitable as well as effective and efficient. We look forward to getting feedback on these assessment criteria in the next couple of months.
- We learned more about uncertainty – we are all working in and making decisions to protect our future, even with so much uncertainty. We discussed the cost associated with taking or not taking action because of the uncertain times we find ourselves in.
- From our work so far and what we're hearing from our communities, we know that we ultimately all want the same thing. One of our group likened it to being in the same storm, but on different boats. We all want to get through the storm but our pathways might be slightly different.

- We know there's a lot of interest in what we're doing. We're looking at ways to broaden our engagement over the next few months – and in addition there will be specific times when we need your feedback.

The next face-to-face workshop is scheduled for Tuesday 20 and Wednesday 21 October at Riversdale. This workshop will focus on reviewing the community and stakeholder feedback on the assessment criteria, preparing for scenario testing and hearing about the draft Southland Murihiku freshwater objectives. Details of the public session are yet to be finalised.