

MINUTES

NEW ZEALAND WALKING ACCESS COMMISSION MEETING

11:00 am, 6 March 2012

NZWAC Boardroom, Revera House

WELLINGTON

Board Members: J Forbes (Chair), P Brown, M Bayfield, B Stephenson and M Barnett.

In attendance: M Neeson (Chief Executive), H Barker (Corporate Services Manager), R Cullinane (Operations Manager).

Opening Comments

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed attendees.

1. Apologies

There were no apologies

Conflict of Interest Register

No conflicts of interest were declared.

Confirm Agenda

The Board confirmed the Agenda for the meeting with the addition of items "Scope for revenue raising activities" introduced by M Neeson and "Overseas Investment Act conditions of sale" introduced by B Stephenson.

2. WAMS 2: project budget approval

The board considered a paper on the progress on the redevelopment of the Walking Access Mapping System (WAMS 2) arising from advice in November 2011, that a substantial increase in funding over the approved budget would be needed if the project were to proceed. At its meeting on 13 February 2012 the board had invited the WAMS 2 Project Steering Committee, at its meeting on 21 February, "to assess the options for WAMS 2 when the necessary financial information is available and to make a recommendation to the board for its next meeting."

The paper built on earlier advice to both the board and the steering committee and the board held an extensive discussion on the project. The board also considered a supplementary paper on options for alternative uses of the Commission's retained funds and verbal advice from the chief executive on the results of an external peer review report from e-Spatial, a Wellington GIS consultancy.

Points arising in the discussion included:

- The implications for the future of the on-going operational costs; R. Cullinane advised that the operating costs for WAMS 2 before depreciation would likely be the same as for WAMS 1 and there would not be any savings. H. Barker

advised that the Commission could accommodate an increase in operational costs of no more than 10%.

- The Commission's internal capability to manage WAMS 2. R Cullinane advised that this is a risk as the Commission's key GIS advisor is leaving in mid-May and, in a worst case scenario, we would have to contract-in assistance.
- If projects other than WAMS were to be funded the Commission would need to be careful about the implications of an on-going commitment of funds.
- Careful consideration would be needed if retained depreciation were to be considered for funding future developments of WAMS.
- That the upgrade to WAMS 2 should not foreclose future development options of the WAMS.
- The e-Spatial report advised that the WAMS project documentation should comment on the link between WAMS 2 and the government's geo-spatial strategy.

The chief executive advised that the e-Spatial report had been received the morning of the meeting and advised that its content was similar to the oral briefing by e-Spatial to the SCOM on 21 February. E-Spatial did not see any issues that would cause WAMS 2 not to proceed as planned. M Neeson proposed that the board ask the SCOM to review the e-Spatial report and ensure that its recommendations are included, where appropriate in the project documentation.

M Barnett proposed that the board ask SCOM to consider the future development of the WAMS including what actions would be needed to ensure its success.

Following the discussion, the chairman thanked B Stephenson (convenor of the SCOM) and M Bayfield (SCOM member) for their work and advice.

Action: The Board

- a) **noted** the revised costs of the project based on the supplier offers that have been received;
- b) **confirmed** its decision to proceed with WAMS 2;
- c) **noted** that the cost of WAMS 2 is not possible within the original budget;
- d) **approved** an increase in the WAMS 2 budget to \$574,000;
- e) **noted** that operational costs may increase by up to \$26,200 annually; and
- f) **invited** the project Steering Committee to review the e-Spatial report and include the recommendations from the report into the project plan.

Moved Mike Barnett **Seconded** John Forbes **Carried**

3. Confirm minutes

Action: The Board confirmed the minutes of the meeting of 13 February 2012 as being a true and correct record.

Moved Maggie Bayfield **Seconded** Brian Stephenson **Carried**

4. Schedule of Significant Correspondence

Action: The Board received the schedule of significant correspondence. The chairman asked that the letter from Ngai Tuhoe be circulated to all board members for their information and invited comments on the matters raised in the letter.

5. Overseas Investment Act: conditions of sale (oral item)

B Stephenson asked whether, following an earlier discussion on the issue of the Overseas Investment Office (OIO) handing down a decision (Coronet Peak) where costs of survey were to be met by the Commission, the Commission was going to pursue this with the OIO. R Cullinane explained the background to the case. M Neeson said that it is not the Commission's policy to accept costs imposed by other entities.

The board agreed that the Commission should not accept such costs in future and noted that at it the February 2012 meeting the chairman and the chief executive were to pursue this topic with the Minister, Land Information New Zealand and the OIO.

6. Scope for revenue raising activities

The board considered a Crown Law Office opinion of 7 February 2012 on the scope for the Commission to engage in revenue raising activities and the implications that it has for the Commission's strategic and revenue generation plans and operations. The board noted that the advice shows that there is a tension, and balance to be managed, between the Commission's defined statutory functions, what people would like it to do and its resources. In effect, there has to be a "clear line of sight" between what the Commission does and the relevant legislation (the Walking Access Act, 2008 and the Crown Entities Act, 2004).

Action: The Board discussed the paper and

- a) **noted** the Crown Law Office opinion of 7 February 2012;
- b) **noted** that the activities of the Commission are confined to those defined in s10 of the Walking Access Act 2008;
- c) **noted** that this may have implications for the extent that the Commission may engage in allied initiatives;
- d) **noted** that an extension of the scope of the Commission's functions would require legislative change; and
- e) **noted** that it is an appropriate topic for consideration during the board's strategic review process in later 2012.

Moved Peter Brown **Seconded** Maggie Bayfield **Carried**

Debrief

The debriefing session included a report by the chairman on the strategic intentions and planning meeting with the Minister, a discussion on the rural-urban divide and the possibility of the Commission hosting a meeting on the topic, planning for the board's trip to Te Urewera and the link between walking access and health policy initiatives including Whanau Ora and district health board "Pathways to Health" programme.

The meeting closed at 12:30 pm

Confirmed

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Forbes". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail on the final letter.

John Forbes

Chairperson

06/03/12