

# MINUTES

## NEW ZEALAND WALKING ACCESS COMMISSION MEETING

**30 September 2009, Sudima Hotel, Christchurch**

**Board Members:** J Acland (Chair), J Aspinall, P Brown, M Bayfield, K Booth, J Forbes, B Stephenson, B Stuart.

***In attendance:***

M Neeson (Chief Executive), H Donaldson; P Litras

### **Opening Comments**

The Chair opened the meeting at 8.30 am and welcomed attendees.

#### **1.1 Apologies**

An apology was received from M Bayfield.

#### **2.1 Conflict of Interest Register**

No conflicts of interest were declared.

#### **3.1 Confirm Agenda**

The Board confirmed the tabled Agenda for the meeting.

M Neeson noted that it is intended that G Nahkies will lead a governance session at the 23 November Board meeting, and outlined the role of P Litras, which includes the management of the move to the new premises and organisational design.

#### **4.1 Public Access Mapping System**

H Donaldson introduced and spoke to the revised business case and project plan.

B Stephenson expressed concern about the late distribution of an amended recommendation that specified the proposed membership of the steering committee. Mr Donaldson apologised for the late notice and explained that one nomination was received after the board papers had been despatched.

B Stephenson asked whether any of the proposed stakeholder representatives on the steering committee had technical expertise.

J Aspinall suggested that it was more important for the steering committee to include representative of potential users with a "lay persons" perspective.

The Board discussed the need to clarify the respective roles of the project manager, the steering committee and the Chief Executive. The board agreed to the business case and project plan subject to clarification of these roles.

K Booth asked for clarification of the term “user testing”. H Donaldson explained that it comprised two components: testing the functionality of the system against the contract requirements, and practical usability by the public.

K Booth indicated that she was concerned about project risk. She asked that a paper be prepared summarising the steps that had been taken to manage project risks.

The Board:

**approved** the combined business case and project management plan for a Public Access Mapping System, subject to the clarification of the roles of the project manager, steering committee and the Chief Executive;

**approved** the membership of the project steering committee as follows:

**John Aspinall (Chair)**

**Brian Stephenson**

**Tony Bevin**

**Hunter Donaldson**

**Ian Maxwell**, Hawkes Bay Fish and Game Council (nominated by Fish and Game New Zealand)

**Matt Harcombe**, Manager, South Island Policy team, Federated Farmers (nominated by Federated Farmers); and

**approved** the work required to complete this project (as outlined in the combined business case and management plan).

**Moved** K Booth      **Seconded** P Brown      **Carried**

## 5.1 Draft Annual Report

M Neeson outlined the process required for completing the annual report including the audit requirements. He noted that the introduction, overview text and notes to the accounts in the version originally submitted to audit had to be rewritten to comply with new international accounting standards and to link more closely to the 2008/11 Statement of Intent.

J Aspinall asked about the difference in the amount of interests received shown in the income statement compared with that in the cash flow statement. It was explained that the former included accrued interest on fixed term deposits that had not yet matured.

The following changes to the report were proposed:

- refer to the relationship with the Overseas Investment Office on walking access conditions included in consents;
- reference discussions with the Te Araroa Trust; and
- record the work that has begun to provide for the contestable fund (funding has been set aside and further work is to be done on processes and criteria).

It was noted that the spelling of Te Roroa should be corrected.

It was noted that the amount spent on contractors was higher than that spent on salaries and wages and that consideration should be given to providing an explanation of the nature of this expenditure.

On page 6 the word “several” should be replaced by “a number of”.

The acknowledgement section (page 7) should include the previous and present responsible Ministers and, in respect of the legislation, note that it was passed with the unanimous support of the House.

J Forbes suggested that the report should also note that the Commission would be exploring in future the scope for sponsorship as a means of supporting walking access initiatives.

The Board agreed to the draft report being finalised for submission to the Minister subject to the amendments that had been proposed.

**Moved** B Stephenson                      **Seconded** J Aspinall                      **Carried**

## **6.1 Regional Forum - Agenda**

The Board reviewed the agenda for the regional forum and the launch of the draft strategy and the outdoor access code that were due to start later in the morning.

The Board agreed that given that not all the attendees were familiar with the background to the Commission, the Chair and Chief Executive would commence with an introduction to the Commission and its role. There would also be a brief description of the mapping project given the likely high level of interest in that initiative.

The attendees would then be invited to comment on each of the two draft documents, and on any other matter of significance. They had been invited to the launch that was to follow the forum.

## **6.2 and 6.3 Draft Code and Draft National Strategy**

The Board noted the improvements in the final versions of the two documents that were to be launched in the afternoon.

The Chief Executive advised that the Commission needed to engage more with the Minister on the extent and nature of its work and that he would consult further with the Board on this.

## **7.1 October Regional Forum and Board meeting – Draft Agenda**

The draft agenda for the forum and meeting was noted. The organisational arrangements were discussed and left to the Chief Executive to finalise in consultation with B Stuart.

The Chief Executive undertook to find the background to an Environment Court case relating to the Delaware Bay area.

## **8.1 Confirm Minutes**

The Board confirmed the minutes of the Board meeting of 24 August 2009, with one correction, as being a true and correct record.

**Moved** J Forbes      **Seconded** K Booth      **Carried**

## **9.1 Matters Arising – Schedule of pending access issues**

The schedule was noted.

## **9.2 Delegation of authority to the Chief Executive**

The Chief Executive explained that following his appointment the previous delegation of financial authority was no longer appropriate. The new proposed schedule reflected the practical operational needs of the Commission.

A board member questioned the “unlimited” category in the schedule.

The Chief Executive explained that the schedule had to be looked at in the context of the whole delegation, and that all spending had to come with the budgeted levels for each expenditure category. For clarity it was agreed to put the words “within the budgeted financial allocation” in the schedule.

Subject to this amendment the delegation was approved.

**Moved** J Forbes      **Seconded** P Brown      **Carried**

## **10.1 Correspondence**

The correspondence was received.

The meeting closed at 10.15 a.m.

**Approved**

J O Acland  
Chairperson  
19/10/09