



Date	Thursday 28 th February 2019
Time	1.30pm - 4.00pm
Location	Charles Fergusson Building – Level 15 Room 15.01, 34-38 Bowen Street, Wellington
Members	Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Stacey O’Dowd (Acting Investment Director, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Charles Ngaki (Te Puni Kōkiri)
In Attendance	s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Apologies	s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

Agenda

Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome & introductions
2.	One Billion Trees Fund overview
3.	Role of the panel & terms of reference <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Panel is advisory. Existing MPI delegations will be used for final approval.• s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] have completed Conflict of Interest forms.• It was agreed the form of the advice should follow the nature of the proposal.
4.	Pipeline <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are 89 items in the partnership pipeline, which include enquiries, applications, expressions of interest and proposals.• Action: s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] to add a quarterly strategic discussion to the Panel meeting agenda.• Action: s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] to confirm the proportion of partnerships in the pipeline involving tree planting for the next meeting.
5.	Break
6.	Applications <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 1BT-00065 TET Waimea Inlet<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Panel noted management and post-planting maintenance were important, especially since the project is volunteer-led.

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel recommended the MPI Lead work closely with Provincial Growth Fund Senior Regional Officials and Te Ara Mahi, an employment and training support agency. • Panel queried the mechanism in place to ensure the right tree is planted in the right place. s 9(2)(a) advised the administrative approach taken is to ensure MPI does not fund the wrong tree in the wrong place. Action: s 9(2)(a) to amend the assessment and recommendation template to include a section showing the consideration taken to identify the wrong tree for the wrong place. • The estimated cost per tree included in the application was queried. Action: s 9(2)(a) to confirm an appropriate range for cost per tree. • Panel commented on the security of co-funding. • Action: s 9(2)(a) to present the risk assessment tool at the next Panel meeting. • Action: s 9(2)(a) to amend the recommendations template to include a risk table outlining reasoning for risk rating and mitigations. • Action: s 9(2)(a) to elaborate on the risk rating in the request for approval for 1BT-00065 TET Waimea Inlet. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommend 1BT-00065 TET Waimea Inlet application for approval.</p> <p>2. 1BT-00022 NZPPI Nursery Capability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NZPPI have identified capability issues in the nursery industry body and will work on a plan to address them. • Panel recommended the Investment Advisors ensure they're connected with other forestry capability work going on in MPI and Te Ara Mahi. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommend 1BT-00022 NZPPI Nursery Capability application for approval.</p> <p>3. 1BT-00062 QEII Native Forest Seed Restoration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel noted the project may provide an innovative reforestation method for native forest. • The Panel queried the number of samples and trial sites. • The Panel noted this is one of the first science applications. • The Panel requested the MPI Lead connects with MBIE's Winning over Wildings programme to ensure wider benefits and confirm funding isn't duplicated. Action: s 9(2)(a) to connect with MBIE's Winning over Wildings programme to ensure wider benefits and confirm funding isn't duplicated for 1BT-00062 QEII Native Forest Seed Restoration application. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion Panel recommend 1BT-00062 QEII Native Forest Seed Restoration application for approval.</p> <p>4. 1BT-00003 Hawkes Bay Regional Council (HBRC) Right Tree Right Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel queried the rationale for applying Crown funds to the project. • s 9(2)(a) advised that in the development of the funding agreement Te Uru Rākau would require HBRC to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Confirm the other Regional Councils support the application,

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Confirm that by supporting it they accept Te Uru Rākau does not create a precedent, ○ Make the methodology, process and outcomes freely available to the other Regional Councils. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the commercial orientation of the application. • The Panel advised an expectation that water quality objectives are addressed in the regional study. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion Panel recommend 1BT-00003 HBRC Right Tree Right Place for approval.</p>
7.	<p>Next Steps</p> <p>The next meeting will be held on 28 March 2019.</p>

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



Date	Thursday 4 April 2019
Time	11.30am – 1.00pm
Location	Charles Fergusson Building – Level 15 Room 15.01, 34-38 Bowen Street, Wellington
Members	Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Stacey O’Dowd (Acting Investment Director, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Tikitu Tutua-Nathan for Charles Ngaki (Te Puni Kōkiri)
In Attendance	s 9(2)(a)
Apologies	s 9(2)(a)

Agenda Item Minutes 1. Welcome, introductions & minutes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted.
2.	Actions and report back <ul style="list-style-type: none">A document was tabled reporting back on the action to confirm an appropriate range for cost per tree. The Panel commented the range given didn’t reflect additional costs for weed control or a tree guard. It was also noted shrubs and trees cost a similar amount.Actions from the previous meeting were reviewed and closed.
3.	Partnerships pipeline update <ul style="list-style-type: none">There are 118 open items in the partnerships pipeline. Forty percent (40%) of these include tree planting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Northland and Hawkes Bay regions are the most represented.Council engagement is ongoing regarding a potential combined bid. The Panel noted regional Council are government organisations, therefore a flexible and high trust approach should be taken.
4.	Grants Pipeline update <ul style="list-style-type: none">There are 135 grant applications in the pipeline.There may be six grant applications coming to the next Panel meeting.
Item	Minutes

5.

Applications

1. 1BT-00042 University of Canterbury Restoration Ambassador

- s 9(2)(a) advised a person mentioned in the application was a fellow board member and declared a potential conflict of interest. The Panel noted the declaration and considered the interest to be insignificant. s 9(2)(a) continued to participate in the discussion.
- The Panel noted the project would provide a strategic opportunity to access University of Canterbury restoration knowledge, expertise and networks.
- The Panel commented the Restoration Ambassador will be working closely with Māori and should have relevant skill and community experience. The Panel recommended Te Uru Rākau are involved in the Restoration Ambassador recruitment. **Action:** s 9(2)(a) to ensure Te Uru Rākau are involved in the Restoration Ambassador recruitment for the 1BT-00042 University of Canterbury Restoration Ambassador project.
- The Panel recommended the agreement include regular reporting.
- The Panel recommended adding a requirement that the Restoration Ambassador work closely with other government agencies and departments.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommend 1BT-00042 University of Canterbury Restoration Ambassador application for approval.

2. Waiapu Package briefing

- The Chair asked the Panel for commentary to inform areas of focus for an application assessment, noting forestry Ministers have the financial delegated authority for approval.
- A. McDonald advised that Department of Conservation is listed as a stakeholder in the briefing. As he hadn't been able to contact the relevant Department of Conservation staff involved in the briefing he recused himself from the discussion.
- The panel did not make a recommendation in relation to this proposal. However, they noted a number of areas for consideration by Te Uru Rākau as the proposal assessment is undertaken:
 - The proposal does not appear to be aligned with 1BT Criteria.
 - The proposal has stronger alignment with PGF Criteria.
 - It may be possible that the proposal could be an enabler for 1BT objectives, for example social license (improving local opinions about forestry in Gisborne).
 - Further advice would be required regarding 'right tree, right place' given the use of poplars & willows.
 - Updated information regarding co-funding is required.
 - Updated information regarding resource consent requirements, and any impact these may have on the project is required.

3. 1BT-00343 Te Matai Ripia Restoration

- The Panel queried the skills rangatahi will learn. Officials advised the skill development involves significant work experience in forestry, work readiness, general life skills, individual responsibility as part of a team member, survival skills, weed and pest control and plant release.
- The Panel queried Health & Safety considerations for the project. Officials advised Health & Safety has been considered, with a portion of land excluded from planting as it is too steep to be

planted safely. Officials confirmed that Health & Safety requirements are included in all funding agreements.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel queried whether the GIS analysis and Technical Analysis of the planting plan would be completed before the application goes to the decision maker. Officials confirmed this would be complete. • The Panel queried the costs of the work experience section of the project, noting they appeared low. Action: s 9(2)(a) to check the costs for 1BT-00343 Te Matai Ripia Restoration, confirming whether the costs include payment to rangatahi. Action: s 9(2)(a) to consult with Te Ara Mahi directly to check costs for 1BT-00343 Te Matai Ripia Restoration are appropriate and verify the organisation's experience in delivering employment programmes. • The Panel queried whether there is scope for rangatahi attrition. Officials advised that in a workplace environment such as this, attrition is expected however replacements would be found. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommend 1BT-00343 Te Matai Ripia Restoration application for approval.</p>
6.	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next meeting will be held on 2 May 2019. • The Panel queried due diligence checks and how this advice is provided to the Panel. Action: s 9(2)(a) to include a due diligence section in the advice going to the Panel. The due diligence information in future panel papers will more closely resemble the due diligence information provided in the PGF assessment process.

DRAFT
 RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



Te Uru Rākau
Forestry New Zealand

ONE BILLION TREES FUND ADVISORY PANEL

Date	Thursday 2 May 2019
Time	1.00pm – 3.30pm
Location	Te Uru Rākau, Level 1, 1 The Terrace, Wellington
Members	Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Stacey O’Dowd (Acting Investment Director, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Charles Ngaki (Te Puni Kōkiri)
In Attendance	s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Apologies	s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

Agenda

Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome, introductions & minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none">The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

2.	<p>Actions and report back</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 9(2)(a) gave an update on action 1BT-APA009 advising Te Uru Rākau will negotiate recruitment involvement during the funding agreement process. • s 9(2)(a) gave an update on 1BT-APA012 advising the development of the due diligence section action is still in progress but will be included in future papers. • s 9(2)(a) gave an update on 1BT-APA011 advising confirmation has been received that costs are appropriate and consistent with industry rates. A site visit with Te Ara Mahi has been arranged next week. • s 9(2)(a) advised 1BT-00065 TET Waimea inlet application hasn't been contracted. Further consideration around tree planting costs and land use approval is required. • s 9(2)(a) advised a paper is in progress for the Waiapu package application. • Action: s 9(2)(a) to include a point of contact section in the advice going to the Panel, where government agencies are listed as stakeholders in applications. • Action: s 9(2)(a) to confirm which region the Chatham Islands is included in. • Action: s 9(2)(a) to work with Te Uru Rākau managers to expand the information and indicators in the 1BT Pipeline graphs in the 1BT reporting dashboard.
3.	<p>Partnerships pipeline update</p>

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 9(2)(a) advised the team receive a number of enquiries about feasibility and nursery eligibility. • There are 117 items in the pipeline, including enquiries, expressions of interest and applications.
4.	<p>Grants Pipeline update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 124 applications in the pipeline. There are 21 approved applications covering 1140ha of land. • The Panel observed that on the basis of the current application flow Te Uru Rākau may not fully commit the 1BT appropriations for 2018/19 year. • The Panel would like to see hectare and dollar information in the reporting dashboard aligned with committed, contracted and actual spend. • The Panel commented on the importance of alignment when considering applications that contain regulatory obligations.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

5.	<p>Applications</p> <p>1. 1BT-00633 KDL Silviculture Training Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel queried whether trainees would receive an hourly rate. s 9(2) confirmed trainees would be paid \$18 per hour. () The Panel queried the difference in costs between KDL and Tree Machine programmes. s KDL will pay trainees and provide employment beyond the end of the programme. The Panel noted on-going employment was a benefit of the programme. 2) The Panel noted the experience of the contractor and the reasonable cost of the project. The Panel queried the contribution of Hancock Forestry Ltd, suggesting co-funding may be appropriate. s 9(2) confirmed Hancock Forestry Ltd were not co-funding the programme. The Panel noted there's a systemic underlying issue where contractor rates don't allow for labour workforce development. () The Panel noted it was a large investment for one cycle of trainees. s 9(2) advised the applicant is a small operator and the programme will provide the additional labour required to undertake their 2019 planting programme. () The Panel queried whether there is scope for attrition. s 9(2) advised some attrition is expected however replacements would be found. () The Panel queried if there are any other upcoming training applications. s 9(2)(a) advised there are more in the pipeline. Action: s 9(2)(a) to share results from a recent forest labour survey. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommend 1BT-00633 KDL Silviculture Training Programme application for approval.</p> <p>2. 1BT-00659 Tree Machine Services Silviculture Training Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel queried the co-funding contribution. s 9(2)(a) confirmed North Tec were co-funding to support the labour workforce development. The Panel queried whether the planting will contribute to the 1BT programme s 9(2)(a) confirmed the majority of tree planted will contribute to 1BT planting objectives. The Panel queried the risk of potentially funding a commercial contract. s 9(2)(a) advised the trainees will receive NZQA accreditation, comprised of practical and knowledge base testing. Upon course completion trainees will have level 2 and 3 NZQA unit standards.
Item	Minutes

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

- The Panel asked for reporting to contain trainee success rate and unit standard completions. **Action:** s 9(2)(a) to ensure reporting contains training success rate and unit standard completion for 1BT-00659 Tree Machine Services Silviculture Training Programme.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommend 1BT-00659 Tree Machine Services Silviculture Training Programme application for approval.

3. 1BT-00044 Ngāti Pāhauwera 1BT Forestry and Land Development

- The Panel queried whether site visits had been planned. s 9(2)(a) advised a site visit has been organised.
- The Panel queried relevance to 1BT criteria s 9(2)(a) advised approximately 150 hectares qualify as erosion prone and the Geographic Information Systems analysis confirmed right tree, right place.
- The Panel queried Ngāti Pāhauwera's previous involvement with Crown Forestry and access to the right advice for indigenous planting. s 9(2)(a) advised Ngāti Pāhauwera are experienced land owners and exotic forestry operators. **Action:** s 9(2)(a) to connect Ngāti Pāhauwera with a regional restoration group who can provide indigenous planting advice.
- The Panel queried Riparian management. s 9(2)(a) advised a fundamental aim of the project is waterway protection and erosion management.
- The Panel queried the monitoring in place to ensure the proportions of species planted are consistent with the funding agreement. s 9(2)(a) advised there is a payment schedule based on monitoring including site visits in place.
- The Panel commented additional mapping is required before the application goes to the decision maker for approval.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommend 1BT-00044 Ngāti Pāhauwera 1BT Forestry and Land Development application for approval.

6. Next Steps

- No general business was noted.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



Date	Thursday 30 May 2019
Time	1.00pm – 4.30pm
Location	Te Uru Rākau, Level 1, 1 The Terrace, Wellington
Members	Paul Nicholls (Chair) Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Bryan Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation),
In Attendance	s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Apologies	Paul Nicholls (Chair) Stacey O’Dowd (Acting Investment Director, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment) Charles Ngaki (Te Puni Kōkiri) Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment) Left at 3.55 PM

Agenda

Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome, introductions & minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none">The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted.
2.	Actions and report back <ul style="list-style-type: none">s 9(2)(a) – The Panel noted the different cost between KDL and Tree Machine programmes. Employed and Trained by KDL. Tree Machine is a different model, training rangitahi to do work for Ngati Maru. Panel noted the experience of Tree Machine with 25+ years experience, and the reasonable cost of the project. The Panel raised systemic issue of not being able to negotiate rates: To mitigate: There has been a series of workshops, based on business fundamentals run by Form ConsultantsPanel discussed – Leadership and support within the industry for the Sustainability of the sector, and how can government assist. s 9(2)(a) – there is currently a paper being put together By s 9(2)(a). This paper will go to the Minister to receive feedback.s 9(2)(a) –1BT-00659 Tree Machine Services Silviculture Training Programme: Contributes to the number of trees planted under the 1BT Programme, Ensure reporting contains training success rate and unit standard completions 9(2)(a) - 1BT-APA018 - Connect Ngāti Pāhauwera with a regional restoration group who can provide indigenous planting advice. – after the site visit on Friday the planting rates predicted will be fine, showing the planting from the first year was in excess of 95% survival rate

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intake: making sure the facilities/conditions are adequate for the planters – applicants installed a lean to for the planting season, effectively extending the facilities. <p>Dashboard – Chair has asked if it is possible to add a simple Carbon sequestration calculation for all grants and partnerships involving tree-planting. TUR will consider the effort required to calculate this number and report back to next Panel. s 9(2)(a) : has asked for advice from TUR.</p>
3.	<p>Partnerships pipeline update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 104 items in the pipeline. • A great deal of interest from Hawkes Bay, Taranaki, Northland and Nationwide • Strike team has been formed and tasked with looking into applications that need attention. • Expansion of the Partnerships team is underway. Five positions available for a 1 July 2019 start. • Waipu Catchment – Paper from RED team has been signed off by three of the four Ministers – if approved will come under One Billion Trees Partnerships allocation.
4.	<p>Grants Pipeline update s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 153 items in the pipeline. • 27 are open conversations with applicants looking for more information. • 96 that are under active management, of that 96, 48 have been entered and are awaiting action from an Investment Advisor (IA) 1/3 of the 96 are currently with the Geo-Spatial team, the rest are with Technical Forestry Assessment team. • 30 are at recommendation for Approval • Total funding requested from the 153 applications/applicants totals \$25.7 million covering the 2019/2020 planting season. • \$9.9 million has been appropriated for this year. • There has been a significant lift in applications, 2019 planting season is imminent which has increased quality applications. • June 20/21 Financial Year, need to have committed all of the funds. • The Nature of the demand across the various Species categories, about 50% Pine or Other Exotic, 25% Manuka/Kanuka and 25% Reversion and Indigenous • 34 applications have been approved.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Overview of the Science input

- s 9(2)(a) expanded on the role of having Science Advisors:
- Science team can see a lot of synergy between projects – Due to confidentiality cannot approach applicants, once it's been recommended for approval they will then contact other applicants who have a parallel application and bring all of the parties together to collaborate.
- **The Panel discussed:** Visibility on how the Science connected with the applications, visibility of the research when it was complete to the wider public and is there a scoring matrix. What process does it go through before it comes before Panel.
- s 9(2)(a) –**Action:** To send email around criteria to the Panel for further breakdown
- Paper has gone to the Minister with \$2 million set aside for the One Billion Trees Science Plan. Document number B18-0752
- **The Panel** were very interested in the science behind various types of exotic as opposed to Native and Pine and what the impacts are.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 82

- s 9(2)(a) - Make time in the agenda for the next meeting to expand on and explain further
Action: s 9(2)
()

Applications:

1BT-00764 Tāne's Tree Trust: Cost- Effective Planting.

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- A lot of time for the fact sheets – timelines are quite far off – maybe bring that forward a bit – science team confirmed it aligned with their science programme.
- Co-funding is 52% some in kind and cost can be broken down and invoiced
- Where will the science information sit, is there a co-ordination of services and a database, do we have a peer review process?
- s 9(2)(a) : Project underway to develop a searchable webpage to be hosted by TUR that will enable easier access to good practice guides and science outputs..
- s 9(2)(a) : Science will review the facts sheets and we have a robust peer review as part of satisfying the criteria
- Any trees planted under the project will go towards 1BT objective

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00764 application for approval

1BT-00606 Acceleration of Propagation Native Trees

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- Research project will improve propagation techniques and technologies, uses paper wrapping instead of plastic and reduces waste.
- 20 native species to be trialled
- All research will be shared with NZ PPI and IP has also been confirmed
- Well supported in BOP 400,000 seedlings

- TUR's policy/approach on accounting for in-kind contributions noting that work already completed has been counted? Is the contribution the same council/entity in kind? •
Action: s 9(2)(a) : To investigate labour vs 'in kind' contributions
- **Action:** s 9(2)(a) to confirm the top ten species?
- There's a need to make sure the technology will work across a range of species

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TUR confirmed the propagation information will be shared with everyone s 9(2)(a) : to ensure funding agreement addresses this issue and ensures that if we fund this proposal that the technology rights/knowledge are distributed widely • The Panel mentioned – the applicants be connected with other applicants to discuss • The Panel noted – Building a portfolio of science to group together to be able to see the key strategic issues. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00606 application for approval</p> <p>1BT-00472 Scion: Re-measurement trials.</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was the basis for one of the science priorities, re-initiation of indigenous and mixed forest trials from the 1980s • Five sites were trial sites and haven't been planted on since. • The Panel noted: Need to know the status of them, if there has been no management conducted. Action: s 9(2)(a) • Science - Unaware whether there was access to all of them and wondered why the re-measure when they are planting something new. • The Scientist Noted: The need to resurvey first to make sure the land is still good and do a revised proposal with more details • Action: s 9(2)(a) to work with s 9(2)(a) to contact Scion with more detail • Action: Science meeting first and then sent to Panel. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00472 application for approval subject to the science matters being satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>1BT-00448 Permanent Forests: Nursery practice Guidelines.</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair queried: Capability and capacity of nursery's and good practice guidelines being developed under the NZPPI project s 9(2)(a) – this project will add to the NZPPI project, Action s 9(2)(a) Include in the funding agreement a requirement to co-ordinate with NZPPI • The Panel required that 1BT confirm and approve the experts. Action: s 9(2)(a) to include confirmation in approval process • The Panel Noted – Some of the experts are 'living legends' and we need to capture their knowledge before its lost forever

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel noted: Is the end point material best placed to be put in a magazine OR a knowledge/digital portal s 9(2)(a) The knowledge hub currently being developed with SCION and Manaaki Whenua will host this info. • The Panel queried: who would draft the report. s 9(2)(a) – MPI Science would like to be a part of the process and pick the peer reviewer <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00448 application for approval</p> <p>1BT-00583 Forest Industry Contractors Association (FICA): Building a sustainable silviculture sector</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of activities designed to raise awareness in the sector • \$270k from 1BT, is there a way to link this to successful outcomes rather than inputs. • 50% co-funding from other project partners needs reconsidered. This is an industry issue that needs resolved but the public/private benefit split suggests industry should be funding more than half. • The Panel noted: It is unclear that the applicant has the capacity and capability to deliver this programme? No mention of Social Media if school leavers are the target audience. s 9(2)(a) to confirm the use of Social media, Radio, Digital Media • The Panel noted – further leverage through MSD case managers could be explored. Action: s 9(2) to provide feedback to applicant • The Panel noted: Strategic issue to attract and train workforce, slightly different issues but (labour supply vrs skills shortage) interconnected. • The Panel queried: Milestones would need to include outputs and how do they measure that? Would expect to see and monitor them • The Panel noted – MSD clients and a focus on NEETS may not be the appropriate avenue as there is a need to link to skilled people but will include them in conversations where appropriate. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00583 application for approval subject to: answering questions raised and bringing to next panel.</p> <p>1BT-00181 NZPPI: Plant Production Biosecurity Accreditation Scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 2 of a 3 stage project that MPI is already part funding, To reduce biosecurity risk • Confirmation needed of the breakdown between central Govt and other funding from Central Govt to ensure that applicant cofunding contribution is appropriate. • The Panel suggested the applicant attend the workshop outlined in application 1BT-00448 to help “socialise” this project • Perceived conflict with regards to co-funding Alan McDonald (DOC) – Action: s 9(2)(a) to note on register that DOC and MPI have invested in this project already • s 9(2)(a) confirmed the project is not limited to the one species • Panel member observed Minginui are also associated with the project. s 9(2)(a) clarified the role of Minginui in the project programme

Item	Minutes
	<p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00181 application for approval</p> <p>1BT-00858 Tāne Mahuta – Training Programme LWYE</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]. The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are a Training provider in the eastern Bay of Plenty, five years' experience working in the forestry sector working with whānau • A strong Kaupapa Maori Focus with semi-retired mentors alongside trainees • Strong Nutrition and wellbeing component, with real life work experience • They have had funding through MSD and MBIE and have delivered successfully • Gradually picking up more and more planting contracts • Use the contracts they have to train people. Doing commercial planting with the trainees • The Panel Noted: This is exactly what we should be funding, agree that this project should link with SCION application + existing knowledge. • Ability to scale and marginal costs should the number of trainees increase was discussed and the likelihood that additional costs would be incurred (specifically a leader/coordinator/proj manager). Panel comfortable that application could be scaled to 20 trainees plus the additional resource without having to come back to panel for reconsideration. • Action: s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] investigate the cost of delivery if the number of trainees increases and ask applicant to update application on the basis of similar cost per trainee plus additional coordination cost. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00858 application for approval</p> <p>1BT-00233 Prolife Manuka (Paul Nichols – Chair, declared conflict of Interest and was recused from the conversation)</p> <p>This application was introduced by P.Hancock. The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application is from Prolife Food Limited. Primarily a Manuka Honey plantation, application is for 2,849 ha in total. • The area of land that was the last to be cleared by the crown in the 1970's, it is on the edge of Whirinaki Forest Park and has done one rotation, the desire is to now plant in natives. • Eco-sourcing all the Manuka which goes around the edge of the virgin forest, adding in mixed indigenous to one quarter of the area. • Will be the largest dedicated Manuka Plantation. Potential to be viewed as a flagship. • Planting will still go ahead without Funding approval, however, Without approval there will be no eco-sourcing and in turn it may be viewed as best practice. If funding is approved, 1BT will have greater visibility and input.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

- s 9(2)(a) - Suggested two thirds of the Grant rate for the things that are of greatest benefit. That is: On erosion prone land and/or is eco-sourced Manuka, Non eco-sourced Manuka funded at one third the Grant rate.
- **Panel member queried**– whether this was a whole farm conversion? s 9(2)(a) confirmed it is vacant land, unproductive and is not a whole farm conversion
- **Additionality** – initial application – best economic result from honey, improving the value to the crown and long term plan is to revert back to native forest and the buffer zone of mixed indigenous.
- **Panel asked** – if the proposal is a commercial investment? Normal assumption would be we don't fund it, we need to be buying something. Manuka doesn't do a lot for erosion or biodiversity – are we interested in that or as general to revert to native forest.
- s 9(2) – Cost effective way to covert forest to native – 295ha into reversion rest to Manuka.
- **Action** s 9(2)(a) – To get information on benefits to funding these types of applications and the broader outcomes.
- s 9(2)(a) – Should this be approved it would be as a Grant not a Partnership.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00233 application for approval at the reduced rate.

1BT-00375 & 1BT-00477 Waimarie Manuka Partnership Applications (whole Farm Conversions

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- Already assessed as ineligible.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel did not support 1BT-00375 and 1BT-00477 and that the application(s) be Declined.

1BT-00554 Mt MacDonald

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- s 9(2)(a) 750ha eligible – whole of farm assessment undertaken, Over \$1 million worth of funding, Commercial return 6.6pa, crown JV team identified \$1800 a ha including the land cost
- **The Panel queried:** the amount of funding requested. s 9(2)(a) : They cannot apply for less \$1,500 ha but we can calculate less dollars per ha
- 100ha previously approved through AGS grant
- **The Panel queried** – has there been an inspection and what is the ability for native reversion, is reversion a possibility. s 9(2)(a) have had full assessment from the land management.
- **The Panel queried:** Have they walked the earth? **ACTION: Site visit required** s 9(2)(a) **to arrange with TFA**

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel Mentioned: The site is described as between 260m and 700m elevation. Has the applicant considered the Pinus attenuata x Radiata cross (KMX pine) for the more exposed / snow prone sites above 450m? This would improve the probability of success; however, supply of the planting stock may be limiting. • The Panel noted: Not approving at the full grant rate. Rate needs to be negotiable. s 9(2)(a) Policy paper leaves room to negotiate discount. • The Emissions Trading Scheme stand down period applies • s 9(2)(a) The application appears to meet the 1BT criteria, right tree, right place, right purpose, recommends an offer should be made and a discount be calculated against the criteria. • The Panel mentioned/queried – it is a water sensitive area – what will this do for water flows, is it a sensitive catchment, stream – what does it affect? • Action: Grants team to talk to Partnerships s 9(2)(a)) to talk about how the discounts will work and create consistency. • The Panel noted: When an Application of this size comes through it needs to have a site assessment. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00554 application for approval subject to: site assessment and grant rate assessment and negotiation</p>
5. ā	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if the 27th June meeting can be moved to 4th July? Will send an email to the panel members with next pack to decide *Shannon to action*

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Item	Minutes
1.	<p>Welcome, introductions & minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted• s 9(2)(a) advised the panel that TPK had withdrawn from the Panel and that Stacey O'Dowd had finished her secondment in to the role that included Panel membership and that Elio Linforth Hall had been nominated as the MBIE Panel representative.

2.	<p>Actions and report back</p> <p>At the previous meeting, the panel noted that Te Uru Rākau needs “a strategic approach to attract and train workforce, slightly different issues but (labour supply vs skills shortage) interconnected”. At this meeting, s 9(2)(a) said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPI and Te Uru Rākau are currently working on a Forest Strategy and Forestry Workforce Action Plan. Te Uru Rākau has formed a Forestry Workforce Working Group to co-design the draft Action Plan by December 2019. The Action Plan will be finalised following decisions on the final Forest Strategy by mid-2020. <p>s 9(2)(a) – 1BT-00472 Scion Re-measurement Trials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With regards to questions about the condition of the 5 sites – 3 of the sites appear suitable. The Funding agreement would allow flexibility. MPI to do a site visit, subject to Forest and Land Use (FALU) site visit, the Funding Agreement can be modified to reflect what we can do with the trial sites.
----	--

Date	Thursday 4 July 2019
Time	1.00pm – 3.30pm
Location	Te Uru Rākau, Level 1, 1 The Terrace, Wellington
Members	Paul Nicholls (Chair) Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment)
In Attendance	Paul Nicholls (Chair) s 9(2)(a) [Redacted]
Apologies	Stacey O’Dowd (Acting Investment Director, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment) s 9(2)(a) (Te Puni Kōkiri)

Agenda.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

□ s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Waiting for Science Advisors for framework around the strategic crossovers.

The Panel noted: The Panel has recently approved a number of science and technology based applications as a means of kick starting endeavours in this area. The Panel requests that TUR develop a strategic science framework (beyond the schedule of priorities) that indicates which areas of science TUR require further work to be undertaken to underpin future 1BT investments. The panel has also requested TUR to identify where there are overlaps in the current funded projects and how these overlaps will be managed. The Panel also asked that the strategy include an approach(es) to dissemination of the science outputs. The Panel would appreciate an update at the next meeting.

Action: s 9(2)(a) [redacted] **to facilitate meeting with Science and provide timeline for when information will be available.**

s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Te Uru Rākau (TUR) has commissioned a piece of work with Manaaki Whenua for an Information Portal to be hosted on TUR Website which will point to information that is hosted elsewhere. TUR will not be authoring any technical or good guidance information under the initial contract.

s 9(2)(a) [redacted] - **1BT-00583 FICA Silviculture project:**

At the last meeting, the panel raised some specific questions about the FICA application, and s 9 [redacted] reported back on them at this meeting: (

- **There is no evidence of engagement with MoE/TEC/NZQA or TPK.**
FICA has advised that Competenz will carry out engagement with TEC and NZQA to ensure connections with schools for the Career Package activity. Competenz has introduced microcredentials (part of the bigger project, and already completed) with NZQA backing.
- **How do these activities support a longer-term solution for the industry?**
If all of the outputs are achieved, these activities will result in increased capacity and capability for the industry. FICA has confirmed this funding will provide a one-off boost and will not be needed next year.
- **Comments about the co-funding split.**
The co-funding for the bigger programme (of which this application is for a small part) includes \$321,000 from the Forest Levy Fund, and \$203,000 from FICA (\$50k cash, the rest in-kind).

The Panel noted: Based on the application and the available information that the application is not sufficiently aligned with the One Billion Trees fund. The Panel also noted that the marketing activities appear to be activities that should be funded by industry and that the core education activities fall within the remit of the Tertiary Education sector and funders. Previously funded training programmes had targeted hard to reach learners that the mainstream sector had not been able to support. This was not the case with the FICA proposal.

Recommendation: Based on the discussion of the revised proposal/updated information – The Panel recommended that application 1BT-00583 be declined.

Item	Minutes
3.	<p data-bbox="244 315 815 353">Partnerships pipeline update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul data-bbox="292 383 831 499" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="292 383 560 412">• Currently 94 open<li data-bbox="292 423 699 452">• 4 signed Funding Agreements<li data-bbox="292 463 831 499">• Progressing more that are in the pipeline
4.	<p data-bbox="244 663 675 701">Grants Pipeline update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul data-bbox="292 719 1469 994" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="292 719 1469 815">• All Grants applications that meet the criteria, irrespective of whether they are recommended for approval or decline to go to the 1BT Advisory panel i.e over \$500k, 300ha or complex will come to Panel.<li data-bbox="292 826 842 855">• Currently 31 Signed Funding Agreements,<li data-bbox="292 866 1369 896">• 50 at the Approved Stage (the funding agreement has not been returned from grantee)<li data-bbox="292 907 1442 994">• 177 actively being managed in the pipeline, 25 of which relate to Landcorp applications, 75 requiring further info from the applicant and 73 being internally assessed (including 19 where recommendations are being written)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

1BT-00502 AUT Living Laboratories.

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **Science:** Strongly aligned with 3 of the 4 science priorities. Significant overlap with other applications that have been before the Panel. Potential to go back and talk to other researchers in the area. In the case of AUT they have already had funding for 3 of the sites, further funding would enable them to expand that research.
- **The Panel:** Would like better understanding of how this fits from a science outcome with other applications.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **reserved their decision on 1BT – 00502 whilst waiting for the strategic framework** referred to above.

1BT-00777 Scion - Soil properties

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** is there value for money that addresses gaps critical to the outcome, Do we have this information already? Will this science actively contribute to the establishment of One Billion Trees?
- **The Panel queried:** Could a national model be created? s 9(2)(a) – yes there could, it is cost prohibitive but it is also building on additional data from 11 years ago

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1992

- **The Chair queried:** Where does it fit in the scheme of things (gap analysis required) Co-funding – several are commercial foresters, will it be cash or in kind?

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **reserved their decision on 1BT – 00777 whilst waiting for the strategic framework** referred to above.

1BT-00761 Rotary 100 Forests

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** Have they identified where the land available for planting is? s 9(2)(a) – there will be a mixture of private and council land.
- **The Panel queried:** Can they achieve the deliverable over the planned 10 days and do they have the manpower for the Planting?
- **Deliverables:** Create a Schedule of the land that they know they've sourced, Making sure they have permission to plant on the land and a Programme of events.

Action s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) to work with Rotary to develop deliverables

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **recommended the** 1BT-00761 application for approval **subject to TUR being satisfied that the matters included under the heading deliverables above resolve the issues raised.**

1BT-00840 Farm Forestry Integration.

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** What is the plan for getting the material widely disseminated?
- s 9(2)(a) The information will be shared through workshops, Forestry Conferences, website(s)
- **The Panel queried:** Who owns the IP, Want to secure there is no impediment to sharing of the information. s 9(2)(a) : TUR has a shared IP and it is open to the public
- **The Panel queried** the possible involvement of Living Water? s 9(2)(a) confirmed they are coming in as a partner.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **recommended the** 1BT-00840 application for approval

Item	Minutes
	<p>1BT-00729 Mangarewa East Trust</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likelihood of reversion is questionable based on altitude and locality/shortage of seed supply • Technical Forestry Assessment was deemed High Risk • The area is unlikely to revert to a natural forest within the 10 year period of the Funding Agreement. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommended that the 1BT-00729 application be declined</p> <p>1BT-00029 Mt Dewar Treespace</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seed Source and likely hood of establishment is low • More attractive commercial proposition, less reversion back to native forest • Technical Forestry Assessment was deemed High Risk • Most of the proposed reversion area is at high altitude (over 500m and up to 1,240m). The area is unlikely to revert to a natural forest within the 10 year period of the Funding Agreement. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommended that the 1BT-00029 application be declined</p> <p>1BT-00797 Mt Olympus Farm</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel noted: The Water availability downstream given the high need for water for the plantation: s 9(2)(a) – the quality and flow on impact will be managed by Regional Council and Resource Consents – the application will only be approved subject to all consents being given and confirmed. They also need to submit the wilding conifer risk calculation as part of that process. • NES-PF requires notification for any plantation forests. • The Panel Queried: is this a commercial investment and the commitment of the applicant to care for the trees and what is the risk to the crown? s 9(2)(a) : The 30% payment in Milestone 1 is insufficient to profit from the Crown. If TFA have concerns at Milestone 1, establishment, sustainability and outcome conditions will be added to the funding agreement to enable Milestone 2 to be reached.

Item	Minutes
	<p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommended that the 1BT-00797 application be approved.</p> <p>1BT-00578 Inverell Partnership Grants Application</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highly erodible land• Land diversification, planting plan meets the right tree, place and purpose <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel recommended that the 1BT-00578 application be approved.</p>
5.	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">□ Next Meeting is Thursday 25th July

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Item	Minutes
1.	<p>Welcome, introductions & minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minutes - correction: 1BT-00761 Rotary Forest of Remembrance: 10 Weeks, not 10 days.□ The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted• New Chair, Peter Clark• New Panel members, Jo Taite from Te Puni Kōkiri and Eliot Linforth-Hall from MBIE □ <p>Conflict of Interest(s) – Recorded in Col Register</p>

2.	<p>Actions and report back</p> <p>s 9(2)(a) – Science Overview – PowerPoint Presentation – Sent to Panel Members</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>1BT-00777 Scion - Soil properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After second science review – the science team are now recommending to decline. □ The panel supported the recommendation 1BT-00502 AUT - Living Laboratories • Collaboration with Tānes Tree Trust • Testing will be done (nationwide) resulting in a database • Based on the update, The Panel supported the 1BT-00502 for approval provided the proposal to be revised meets the gaps identified by the science team.
----	---

Date	Thursday 29 August 2019
Time	1.00pm – 5.00pm
Location	Te Uru Rākau, Level 1, 1 The Terrace, Wellington
Members	Peter Clark (Chair) Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation) Jo Taite (Te Puni Kōkiri)
In Attendance	<p>s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Damian Diack (Director, Forest Development, Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a)</p>
Apologies	s 9(2)(a) – Left 1.45PM, s 9(2)(a) – left 2.15PM, s 9(2)(a) – left 4.15PM

Agenda.

Item	Minutes
	<p>s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>1BT-00233 Prolife Foods Maungataniwha Manuka plantation application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The panel queried: Panel had recommended for approval but decision maker then declined. • s 9(2)(a) the application has been revised and will now be processed as a 1BT Grant

3.	<p>Partnerships pipeline update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 104 Applications in the pipeline • 24 are in the Panel process or post Panel process • In the process of on-boarding four more Investment Advisors (IA's) • Actively Interviewing for one more IA • There are now two people on the ground in Northland • The Panel advised loading the Science Funding, i.e: considering the six million sooner rather than later, rather than an 'artificial' two million per annum allocation over 3 years. This allows flexibility for science applicants.
4.	<p>Grants Pipeline update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>1BT Operational Overview presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big applications coming next month from Kaipara, Hokianga and Northland • More opportunities will be coming out of the Regional Council Partnerships • Aiming for 5 million a month – currently at 4 million a month • 60.4% is native planting • 70 in the pipeline at 'entered stage' • 123 in the pipeline 'in progress'
	<p><u>Applications presented to Panel:</u></p> <p>1BT 01209 Moemotu Station Ltd (Grant Application)</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are QEII overlaps so permission to plant needs to be obtained from QEII as well as the landowner before the applicant is offered a Part 2 funding agreement. • TUR's recommended approval for the allocation of a Landowner grant of up to \$593,385 for a total of 241.3 hectares of plantation Mānuka (224.8 hectares) and mixed indigenous (16.5 hectares) on a property in the Mahia Peninsula, triggers the whole farm conversion criteria. • The applicant will need to withdraw formally from the AGS • The applicant need to confirm they can acquire the seedlings • The Myrtle Rust aspect. The 1BT Programme Governance Group has considered the spread of myrtle rust through 1BT funded projects and it is currently noted as a risk on the RAID Register (R-30). There are no specific treatments or controls relating to myrtle rust, although previous Risk R-18 (now incorporated into R-30) noted Ministry communications campaigns as a control. • Is on 95% of erosion prone land – Land Class 6 & 7 'E' • The Panel Queried: what is their longer term management plan and will they enter into the ETS • s 9(2)(a) ACTION: DH to report back to next Panel meeting with management plan. Yes, they will enter into the ETS • The Panel queried: the value of Erosion Top ups s 9(2)(a) : the Erosion tops ups are based on the erosion prone land and are binary.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the **1BT-01209** application.

1BT-00613 Maanaki Whenua Social licence and barriers to planting partnership.

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** The understanding of public attitudes to forested landscapes and are they intentionally keeping the wording quite open. s 9(2)(a) to ascertain what affects them all. Phase 1; is addressing, Community, Maori and Landowners. Phase 2; targeted interviews based on answers to Phase 1.
- **The Chair mentioned:** Are there any misconceptions? Would like to see questions focused on what are Landowners thinking, and misconceptions, specifically what is stopping the planting. s 9(2)(a) : **TUR** will collaborate to develop the survey.
- **The Panel mentioned:** Other government agencies may like some input in terms of design of policy instruments.
- **The Panel mentioned:** it would be interesting and helpful to understand overall societal attitudes and concerns.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the **1BT-00613** application.

1BT-00855 Nga Kaitiaki O Hohepa Nursery Expansion

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** Do they have their own clients out planting? s 9(2)(a) : Yes, they will be working in the nursery and out planting.
- **The Panel mentioned:** DoC is involved from the perspective that they work with the Nursery institute rather than individual nurseries. No perceived Conflict of Interest.
- **The Chair:** if they do end up with surplus what would be their selling price? s 9(2)(a) – will recommend that they need to be sold at commercial rates.
- **The Panel Requested:** If an announcement is to be made, that it links with Department of Conservation. Also that the distinction be made with regards to this application being of social and environmental importance as opposed to other nursery applications that have been declined due to the commercial concerns.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the **1BT-00855** application.

1BT-00468 Scion Towards native trees establishment success

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel mentioned:** Sprays can be sprayed killing weeds and not viable species. There is a targeted set of species.
- **The Panel mentioned:** Great benefit to the community and the crown.
- **The Panel queried:** Why there is only one chemical supplier provided and making sure one supplier doesn't get preference over others s 9(2)(a) : We will ensure the IP will be shared.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

- **The Panel queried:** Will we be able to capture the trees used for research. s 9(2)(a) : Will be keeping the control area small and focused.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00468 application.

1BT-00713 QLDC Wilding Reforestation Project

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel mentioned:** There looks to be a biodiversity issue, it doesn't fit within the remit of One Billion Trees.
- The project is not additional, as it is replacing existing trees.
- **The Panel queried:** The Fencing cost. s 9(2)(a) Designed to keep out rabbits and other small pests. They wouldn't receive funding till proof of work has started.
- s 9(2)(a) To remove trees to plant another species is in contradiction to what the fund is trying to achieve. The proposal would not be "new forest" as that land would not be deforested before the natives are planted.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel did not support the 1BT-00713 application.

1BT-00682 GWRC (Greater Wellington Region Council) (EOI)

1BT- 01189 Waikato Regional Council Riparian Restoration Project (EOI)

1BT- 01255 Taranaki Regional Council Riparian planting (EOI)

These applications were introduced by s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the applications and focused on the following key issues:

- All have co-funding by landowner(s) and/or Applicable Regional Council.
- All the land is highly erosion prone or riparian.
- **The Panel queried:** how easy will it be to incorporate/collaborate with all landowners? s 9(2)(a) : The council(s) are in touch with landowners.
- **The Panel Mentioned:** Riparian planting doesn't meet the 1BT species criteria but is in the policy for exemption.
- **The Chair queried:** whether all species planted need to be over 5 meters in height? s 9(2)(a) : There will be tall trees within the planting areas as well as standard riparian plants.
- **The Chair mentioned:** Quarterly reports and the funding be meted out according to key performance indicators being met.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supports the 1BT-00682, 1BT-01189 and 1BT-01255 application.

1BT-01099 Manawanui Taonga Sanctuary.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** What was the breakdown of co-funding? s 9(2)(a) : In kind contributions. Retirement of land currently under lease will contribute to the co-funding, qualified foresters volunteering their time, venues, trainer and Kāhui ako.
- **The Panel mentioned:** Training seems to be more about medicinal than planting. s 9(2)(a) : Primary aim is utilising and getting something back from the forest.
- **The Panel queried:** Will what they are researching be available on the TUR website? s 9(2)(a) : Yes s 9(2)(a) : Manawanui have been very open and active about sharing the knowledge.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01099 application.

1BT-00962 North Hokianga Rohe

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- s 9(2)(a) : There are already landowners ready to apply for 1BT Grants, but there are others that don't have the governance to apply – this is where this would assist
- **The Panel queried:** The vehicle running cost was quite high: s 9(2)(a) : This is due to the fact they need 4 wheel drives in the far north.
- **The Chair queried:** Whether Northland Regional council and Unitech are committed to providing and have technical (IT) support? s 9(2)(a) : confirmed they are.
- **L. Rawson:** Te Puni Kōkiri have already scheduled a hui in October to work with Landowners and Maori Land Trusts
- **Recommendation:** On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported 1BT-00962 Application, provided that the mitigations around key performance indicators and technical criteria are met.

1BT-00559 Kaipara Harbour Stakeholders water issues

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Chair mentioned:** Assurances they are committed to providing, and have, technical (IT) support. s 9(2)(a) Yes they have.
- **The Panel mentioned:** Making sure the deliverables and key performance indicators are being met.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00559 application.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

1BT-01075 Ngāti Porou Whanui Ltd

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel noted:** Making sure they have the technical/back office support.
- **R. Hiha-Agnew:** Science proposals may cross over and have positive impact on this project.
- **The Chair queried:** Whether the Hansol JV had generated a stumpage share for the existing Ngāti Porou forest landowners?
- **The Panel queried:** The cash co-funding, and that due diligence would be done on more tangible quotes.
- **The Panel noted:** Would like to see further breakdown on what the funding will be spent on and whether there is a risk of a precedent being set.
- s 9(2)(a) Other science projects are developing landowner tools, there is potential they have the knowledge within the science area already.
- **The Panel noted:** The potential to split the application over 2 stages being replant and new forest.
- **The Panel queried:** The wider application of the Model Decision Making tool – **TUR** need to be assured of ownership.

Action s 9(2)(a) **The Panel would like more clarification and breakdown on what the funding will be spent on. More detail: business plan, project plan and/or confirm cash co-funding and/or financial position. Assurance of ownership.**

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel was unable to reach a decision until it receives more information, subject to the report back around the **Actions** stipulated. The Panel will consider any additional information at a future meeting.

2.1BT-01145 ManaiaSAFE Phase 1 Te Tairāwhiti expansion project

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** The projections for revenue, how far below their projection are they? s 9(2)(a) : They've exceeded their revenue targets they projected for their first report. s 9(2)(a) Higher cost due to 1 on 1 training creating a safer ratio. 9(2)
- **The Chair mentioned:** If there is satisfaction around the governance there should be no barrier to funding.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01145 application.

Item	Minutes
5.	<p data-bbox="244 331 480 360">General Business:</p> <ul data-bbox="292 387 1449 853" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="292 387 1449 555">• (DD) Due Diligence process: Making sure all the processes in place to make sure we're not funding the wrong people. S [REDACTED]: From a partnership perspective, DD is included, but not formally, in the assessment process.<li data-bbox="292 577 1449 779">• The Content of papers that go to panel are too much S [REDACTED]: it is easier to attach the application and create a summary and recommendation with changes recorded. ACTION: Future Panel papers to include the full application but also an expanded section of officials' recommendation, observations and any concerns, including additional information obtained from applicants up to the date papers are distributed to the Panel.<li data-bbox="292 790 1449 853">• Updating the website with accurate wording and guidance for applicants. The Website has been updated with more detailed wording and will be an ongoing action. <p data-bbox="244 931 392 960">Next Steps:</p> <ul data-bbox="292 987 906 1016" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="292 987 906 1016">• Next Meeting is Thursday 26th September 2019

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



Date	Thursday 26 September 2019
Time	1.00pm – 3.30pm
Location	Te Uru Rākau, Level 1, 1 The Terrace, Wellington
Members	Peter Clark (Chair), Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation)
In Attendance	Damian Diack (Director, Forest Development, Grants and Partnerships), § 9(2)(a) [Redacted]
Apologies	Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment) Jo Taite (Te Puni Kōkiri)

Agenda.

Item	Minutes
1.	<p>Welcome, introductions & minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minutes Correction:• With regards to Riparian Planting: As well as quarterly reporting, The Panel advised a sunset clause noting the number of stake-holders/landowners• TUR need to be assured of ownership in the tools developed for 1BT- 01075 such that they can be applied or modified to use across NZ. Updated Action: Assurance of ownership of the tools developed.• The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted• Hill Country Erosion Fund (HCE) Overview. § 9(2) presenting. Refer to P/Point Presentation Action: § 9(2) to send presentation to Panel.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

2.	<p>Actions and report back</p> <p>Action: s 9(2) : Circulate the APR register to make sure Actions get closed.</p> <p>Action: s 9(2) : Add Conflict of Interest as a standing item in the Agenda</p> <p>Due Diligence (DD) process: s 9(2)(a) : DD framework complete, all partnerships applications are being assessed through the process as they're coming in. Action closed. □</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1BT-01209 Moemotu Action Report Back</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the report back the Panel supported 1BT-01209 application.</p>
----	---

Item	Minutes
	<p>1BT-01075 Ngāti Porou - Report Back:</p> <p>The Chair mentioned:</p> <p>The IP tool development and ownership –The applicant has confirmed it accepts that the Crown will have full rights to the IP the tool. This will be included in the contract.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2) have given Ngāti Porou a template Business Plan which will help break down the spend, focusing on the work that is required to be done and clarity on who will do the work.</p> <p>The Chair Noted: they are well managed, good forest skills and capability and track record and to support this project, with its actual scale and tranches of funding being determined by the officials, once they have the business plan.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a) – Ngāti Porou are very open to working with others to develop IP, Business and Project Plans.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel Supported 1BT-01075 with appropriate trancing of funding meeting the needs of the business plan.</p>
3.	<p>Partnerships pipeline update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team number is now up to 8 • 108 items in the pipeline • \$15 million of new initiatives has come in to the pipeline.
4.	<p>Grants Pipeline update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$28 million in the pipeline with \$9 million dollars having come in within the last 4 weeks □ As of 16th September 2019 at \$15.6 million approved – 171 approved Grant Applications. • Confident we will allocate the fund within the timeframe. □ <p style="text-align: center;">Indigenous 59.4% vs Exotic 40.6%</p>

Applications presented to Panel:

1BT-00575 Jedburgh Station Afforestation Grants.

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- Application is for planting unproductive land
- Land applied for is LUC 5-6
- Forest and Land Use Team (FALU) have done a site visit, they raised concerns about their proximity to a Department of Conservation (DoC) forest and were concerned that there was a high wilding risk. s 9(2)(a) : Applicant will plant a buffer of *Pinus attenuata* to reduce risk.
- **The Panel queried** – Whether the applicant would be open to planting *P. attenuata* instead of Douglas Fir.
- **The Chair Mentioned:** If wilding spread is a threat to neighbouring properties, then the applicant will need to address that potential issue before planting and provide assurances.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

- s 9(2)(a) : According to the current wilding calculator, if it comes in with a score of 12 or less, no consent needed. The Regional Council won't stop the planting happening but will get advice on how to mitigate the wilding issue.
- **The Panel queried:** There are reservations around integrity of the tool used for Conifer assessment and can we investigate contractual binding remedies within the contract? s 9(2) : Getting an independent wilding risk assessment would be a requirement. s 9(2)

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **deferred its decision** till more information is provided with regards to the concerns raised and an independent wilding assessment for the 1BT00575 application.

1BT-01167 Otakanini Topu Inc. Indigenous planting.

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel mentioned:** DoC supports the application but there is concern around the Karaka trees and that this is classed as an archaeological site. s 9(2)(a) : They will be planting a buffer to protect them and applicants are alerted to the fact there is an archaeological site and they'll need to provide evidence of resource consent to be able to plant which is stipulated within the contract.
- **The Panel mentioned:** Māori will benefit directly from the application. Te Puni Kōkiri wonders whether a Marae riparian project could potentially be included within Otakanini Topu application and whether 1BT would consider funding that as an additional opportunity. s 9(2)(a) : We do have the Matariki Tu Rākau fund which has just been expanded. **D. Diack:** Covers any Community based planting under/over 1 hectare.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01167 application.

1BT 00239 Tararua District Council

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** What's the timeframe for this to be completed? s 9(2)(a) . Within 12 months.
- **The Panel queried:** Is MPI able to provide information that is currently available?
- s 9(2)(a) Previous contracts with Horizons, they have feasibility studies and they will contribute to this project.

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair mentioned: There is a lot of material already out in the market, using search engines. Also the Scion library source and information in the Farm Forestry Association website, they have experts in specific species who share information freely. Whomever leads this project will need to make sure they get in touch with the right people and collate the information already out there. • The Panel queried: How do they manage the quality of what's produced? If it does work well this could be another asset that can be leveraged through the Partnership Programme. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00239 application.</p> <p>1BT-01307 Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia - Takou Block Kauri Sanctuary</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair mentioned: Clarity on legal ownership. s 9(2)(a) : Maori Freehold land with a set of Trustees – Maori Reservation. s 9(2)(a) also noted that a small area within the land title had a mortgage on it. s 9(2)(a) : ACTION: Clarification on liabilities will be sought and full details provided. • This application is required to go to Forestry Ministers for approval. • The Panel mentioned: DoC is an adjoining land owner to the west and have identified pigs in particular are a high risk in that area and their population shouldn't be underestimated. Pigs are believed to be a strong vector of transmission of Kauri Dieback. • The Chair mentioned: Being a phytophthora the best defences are likely to be genetically resistant clones and or endophytes to combat the disease, to work in conjunction with a predator proof fence? • The application would be more robust if they sought some expert input into the design of the Sanctuary. At the moment it appears that no expert advice has been requested. • Could they appeal to philanthropists for sponsorship? Or to major industry suppliers to assist with design and help with the large machinery that would be needed? • The Panel mentioned: There are a number of nested activities within the application. They would need to seek external advice. • Te Puni Kōkiri notes Takou Kauri Sanctuary proposal is subject to a number of conditions. Te Puni Kōkiri can offer support to develop governance capability building if required as would Department of Conservation. • C. Stephenson: They have local seed collected from their local iwi groups as part of the Healthy Trees, Healthy Futures initiative. Scion has been testing wider sourced seed to find or create a more resistant Kauri. Scion has prepared a sanctuary management plan as part of earlier funding. • The Panel queried: The sustainability of the sanctuary. Although it is stated that surplus income from Shared Services will fund the future funding needs the panel expressed

concern that the financial surpluses modelled look optimistic for a start-up business with no track record.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Item

Minutes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• s 9(2)(a) stated that the Shared Services model seemed to ensure the sustainability of the sanctuary after Crown funding ceased. However full details of that model have not been supplied.• The Panel mentioned: They would need to get the quote for the double predator proof fence and the ongoing cost of protecting the integrity of the fencing.• ACTION: s 9(2)(a) . Acquire more information on their shared services model.• ACTION: s 9(2)(a) . More information on the Takou Kauri Sanctuary Business and Management plan. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel deferred their decision until such time as more information becomes available for the 1BT-01307 application.</p>
5.	<p>General Business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• December 1BT Panel Meeting – if there is anything to be reported back to panel, it can be dealt with via email and any new papers for panel to consider to be deferred till Jan/Feb <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next Meeting is Thursday 31st October 2019

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome, introductions & minutes <input type="checkbox"/> The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted.

2.	<p>Conflict of Interest, Actions and Report Back Conflict of Interest Declared:</p> <p>P. Clark: PF Olsen is the Landcorp forestry manager for 1BT-00769 Te Apiti Station application. I remain a shareholder of PF Olsen, therefore will recuse myself from the discussion and E. Linforth-Hall will step in as Chair.</p> <p>B. Smith: Personally knows s 9(2)(a) (Forestry Manager) Memos Appeals Paper – will recuse himself from the discussion.</p> <p>Kauri Sanctuary Update: s 9(2)(a) : Have met with Ngāti Rehia and have spoken about supporting Ngāti Rehia getting a detailed business case developed with the help of a third party which will be ready for next panel meeting update.</p> <p>Actions: s 9(2)(a) to make sure all unresolved or open Actions in the Panel Register are closed before next Panel meeting.</p>
----	--

Date	Thursday 31 October 2019
Time	1.00pm – 3.30pm
Location	Te Uru Rākau, Level 1, 1 The Terrace, Wellington
Members	Peter Clark (Chair), Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation) Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment) Jo Taite (Te Puni Kōkiri)
In Attendance	Damian Diack (Director, Forest Development, Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a) <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div>
Apologies	

Agenda.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Item	Minutes
	<p>Motutapu: C. Stephenson: Conversations between relevant parties are continuing and are close to resolution.</p>
3.	<p>Partnerships Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have been concentrating on getting Funding Agreements sent to applicants, 10 completed and signed within the last 2 months. • 11 under negotiation stage. • Waiapu Funding Agreement was signed recently for \$5 Million. It is the 3rd biggest Partnership to date. • s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Monitoring and Engagement) currently developing an engagement plan for every region for the 2020 year.
4.	<p>Grants Pipeline Update: D. Diack</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently transitioning from contractors in Wellington, to the permanent team in Rotorua, this has resulted in a loss of a momentum, however, there are some large applications being presented to panel. • As part of the Engagement plan, Application clinics in Tairāwhiti and Northland will be held in early 2020 as a trial. Investment Advisors, accountants, farming leaders and farm and forestry consultants will be target audience. Forest and Land use, Geo-spatial, Grants and Partnerships will all be involved. • 114 Grant applications in the pipeline, totalling 8000ha in planting. • 15 new applications came in the last week, this is due to the time of year and being outside the planting season.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Applications presented to Panel:

1BT-01184 NZFFA Website Refresh

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]. The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- Due diligence has identified they are a low risk organisation.
- **The Panel queried:** Additionality to this as opposed to other similar funding applications, will there be overlap with other applications or is this unique? s 9(2) [REDACTED] Other funding applications for websites have specifically targeted new information. NZFFA have identified the knowledge gap and are trying to create one

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

place for Farmers and Foresters to get all the information they need, includes a wide range of input from various sectors. This project is to collate existing information and an upgrade to the website to allow easier access and distribution.

- **The Panel queried:** Will there be information set on erosion, riparian, management, and species? s 9(2)(a) : Tānes Tree Trust are doing that work and there are links which can be built into the website.
- **The Chair mentioned:** Would be beneficial if a search element was built in to get to other websites. Linking NZFFA to other relevant websites such as Southern Cypress, The Redwood Company, Drylands Forests Initiative and Tānes Tree Trust.
- **The Panel queried:** Will this inform new or future users about permissions they may need with respective councils? **D. Diack:** No, This is only looking to update their website and making it more relevant to their members.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01184 application.

Memo to Panel – Appeals

This paper was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the paper and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** The extent to which the eligibility criteria material that is on the website could have been interpreted. s 9(2)(a) : It's not explicit.
- **D. Diack:** The thinking with regards to information on the website was evolving and will be clearer going forward, some applicants had looked at the One Billion Trees Fund as similar to the Afforestation Grant Scheme. The One Billion Trees Fund is more nuanced.
- **The Chair mentioned:** There is a policy paper on the purpose and rationale of the fund, it is discoverable but not easily found and not linked on the website.
- **The Panel mentioned:** There will always be an element of interpretation, to what extent did applicants rely on the material available. s 9(2)(a) : When they first applied it was the old version of the website, there is more information available now.
- **The Panel queried:** Did the applicants speak to Investment Advisors within 1BT? s 9 : Yes, but, no assurances are given to applicants as they need to go through the process first.
- **The Chair mentioned:** Based on the information on the website, they appear to qualify. This can be fixed for the future but due to the information they had access to at the time of their enquiry it could be interpreted that they would qualify.

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel queried: What is the magnitude of the exposure in terms of funding requested and what precedent will it set? D. Diack: It equates to approximately 2% of the applications we have so far received. • ACTION: Website “eligibility criteria” section to be updated to include a further item headed “Additionality” that alerts the reader to a filter that says MPI will review the application and make an assessment based on both the applicant and the project of whether the project would likely go ahead in part or in total without 1BT financial support. P. Clark/s 9(2) <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the processing of these appeals and an update to the website to reflect conditions, objectives and purpose of the Fund.</p> <p>1BT-00769 Landcorp – Te Apiti Station. (P. Clark left the room, E. Linforth Hall Chaired this discussion)</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a). The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel queried: Has it been to Ministers for approval? s 9(2)(a) : Since the inception of the Emissions Trading Scheme Landcorp are expanding their plantation and looking to plant 6000 ha. They’ve approached Ministers during the development stage of the One Billion Trees Fund. • There has been an investigation into the rules around State Owned Enterprises applying for funding, there are no World Trade Organisation rules prohibiting them applying. • This has also been tested with the Ministers and they have decided they should be treated as any other applicant. • The Panel queried: How have the applications been progressing? s 9(2)(a) : Currently 21 applications submitted, 7 at Approved, 4 at Recommended, with the balance still progressing. For 2019 planting: \$1.7 million in total with \$1.4 million is at the hectare base rate. • D. Diack: We are getting advance notice of 2020 planting aspirations. s 9(2)(a) : Currently 14 applications ready to submit, equating to 1,400 hectares at \$2.3 million excluding any top up funding they may require. • The Panel queried: The public perception with regards to planting large tracks of State Owned Enterprise land? s 9(2)(a) : Landcorp are required to meet the eligibility criteria as set out in the in the One Billion Trees Fund, as with any applicant.

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 9(2)(a) Any large scale applications may come under increased scrutiny. s 9(2)(a) The case studies provided by PF Olsen and Landcorp will help mitigate that concern as well as having the broader objectives publicised. • The Panel queried: The increased planting of Eucalypts, has it been factored in that they are a flammable species? s 9(2)(a) : The Technical Forestry Assessment doesn't cover that aspect, the East Coast is perfectly suitable due to the land characteristics and it is up to the applicant to insure as per Funding Agreement. • The Panel queried: Where does this application sit with regards to the additionality test? s 9(2)(a) : Landcorp would not be able to do their planting programme to the same scale without funding. • The Panel queried: Landcorp note that this is part of an extended programme. Is 1BT able to see what their entire programme entails? D. Diack: That has been requested. We have started a more strategic conversation and that is continuing. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel deferred their decision for the 1BT-00769 application until they can see their Strategic Long Term Plan.</p> <p>P. Clark re-joined the meeting.</p> <p>1BT-01106 Hukarere Station.</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hukarere Station is an organic sheep and beef farm that is partially on Crown Pastoral Land. This is a significant Indigenous planting project, planting over 3-4 years. They are retiring land that is non-productive as grazing land. • The Chair queried: They are currently under a tenure review, will the land be returned to the Crown? • The Panel DOC representative mentioned: There has been Department of Conservation representation in the application process as it is very complex. Whether it will be returned to DOC or not is not yet clear.

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="293 322 1493 412">• The Chair stated: They will need to have the on-going status on the land clarified before Panel can make a recommendation. <p data-bbox="245 568 1423 645">Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel deferred their decision till the status of the land is clarified on the 1BT-01106 application.</p> <p data-bbox="245 788 587 819">1BT-00636 Atihau Station</p> <p data-bbox="245 846 1410 922">This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="293 1003 1484 1079">• The Chair mentioned: This has only come to the Panel due to the scale, and it meets all eligibility criteria. <p data-bbox="245 1223 1362 1299">Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00636 application.</p> <p data-bbox="245 1384 501 1415">Operational Policy:</p> <p data-bbox="245 1447 1484 1612">The Panel and TUR staff had a broad discussion on whether to apply reduced funding rates for large applications and subsequent applications from a single applicant or for any other reason. No firm position was reached and this area will be further discussed at the next strategic Panel session.</p> <p data-bbox="245 1644 1461 1720">ACTION: Officials to develop criteria that would trigger reduced per hectare funding rates so that they can be discussed and, if supported, consistently applied.</p>

5.	<p>General Business:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> In the November meeting there is scheduled a "Strategic Discussion". It was decided to postpone this till the January/February Meeting. Online discussions can be had depending on information acquired via the various Panel Members if necessary</p>
Item	Minutes
	<p>beforehand. The panel agreed that if any decisions are required over the summer break period they can be done via email.</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Next Meeting is Thursday 5th December 2019</p>

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



Date	Thursday 5 December 2019
Time	1.00pm – 5.00pm
Location	Te Uru Rākau, Level 1, 1 The Terrace, Wellington
Members	Peter Clark (Chair), Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Jo Taite (Te Puni Kōkiri)
In Attendance	Damian Diack (Director, Forest Development, Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a) [Redacted]
Apologies	

Agenda.

Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome, introductions & minutes <input type="checkbox"/> The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

2.	<p>Conflict of Interest, Actions and Report Back Conflict of Interest Declared:</p> <p>E. Linforth-Hall: I am a trustee of a family trust of some friends. My friends – s 9(2)(a) - applied and were successful in receiving 1BT funding. The applicant was s 9(2)(a). This was before I was a member of the panel, so this is simply a note to keep records straight. If any matters arise in relation to this application, I will excuse myself.</p> <p>1BT-01307 Te Runanga o Ngati Rehia – Takou block : s 9(2)(a)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Panel noted: that with no legal access to the proposed sanctuary site, it made approving the application difficult. Their neighbour Kauri Cliffs provides access through an informal arrangement. Access to the proposed sanctuary site should be secured for the duration of the build stage from Kauri Cliffs.</p>
----	---

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair stated: that the recommendation of the appointment of a reputable, independent project management organisation meant that all recruitment and accounting responsibilities can be undertaken by that firm. Te Uru Rākau would not need to be on the governance board or involved in recruitment. • The Panel queried: if training had been requested and if Te Ara Mahi had been approached. s 9(2)(a) confirmed that Te Ara Mahi had been approached but planning couldn't take place until they knew if the proposed kauri sanctuary application had been approved. She advised the Panel that Ngati Rehia were meeting with MSD on Friday 6 December to discuss establishing a work plan for Rangitahi. • The Panel noted: There is a risk that 'sanctuary' implies that it will be pathogen free forever. A predator proof fence in a coastal environment would have a lifetime of ten years, and will be compromised where build on shifting sand dunes, and in itself is not a guaranteed barrier to soil-borne phytophthora infestation. • The Panel noted: that the last soil test for <i>Phytophthora agathidicida</i> (kauri-dieback disease or PA) was completed in 2018. Soil testing to ensure the proposed site remains PA free should take place prior to any establishment work commencing. • The Panel noted: that co-funding had not been sought for this project since the September 2019 Advisory Panel meeting. The Panel agreed that co-funding and/or sponsorship opportunities should be sought and secured within one year of the project commencing, if approved for funding. • The Panel suggested: that 1BT Partnerships fund the cost of an 8 wire fence and the balance for the requested predator proof fence be acquired from sponsorship and/or co-funding. • The Panel agreed: that this project should be completed in stages with stop/go points at the beginning and end of every stage. <p>ACTION: Establish the range of activities and the costs that fits within 1BT Partnership funding, criteria to a maximum cost of \$5,000,000. s 9(2)(a)</p>
3.	<p>Partnerships Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 items/projects are post-panel, focussed on getting these contracted. • The 1BT Engagement& Monitoring team are planning a series of workshops next year, to focus on getting stories out there. • Videos have recently been launched which outline case studies of how the 1BT programme has made a difference. <p>ACTION: Send links to the videos to panel members s 9(2)(a)</p>
4.	<p>Grants Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p>

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$9 million of grant applications are sitting in the pipeline, of which \$3.8 million is pine. Administrators are trying to clear the back log. • 40 contracts are currently under review. • Recruiting to four roles at the moment. Losing some resources due to contractors finishing up. • A new measure has been introduced to the grants management system – ‘date since last modified’. This stops applications sitting there for long periods. Our target is 60 days to process applications but the range has been 9 days to over 100 days. • Focus is on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Turnaround time of grants ii) Chasing those in awaiting customer status iii) Process improvements
	<p><u>Applications presented to Panel:</u></p> <p>1BT-01373 D & C Tweeddale – Carkeet Block</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01373 application.</p> <p>1BT-01310 Ngamatapouri Land Company Ltd</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel queried: If we should be funding for erosion control without knowing that this actually works given the rotational clearance replant of manuka to maintain flowering for honey. s 9(2)(a) : We will research this and check the erosion top up. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01310 application.</p> <p>1BT-01304 Waikino Station</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel requested either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) an independent WC assessment of any species proposed for planting, and that s 9(2)(a) of the MPI WC team be consulted to see if any MPI work was being undertaken in the vicinity of the project; or

Item	Minutes
	<p>(b) Douglas fir be substituted on the block that scored 11 with a species that scored a much lower and acceptable WC assessment.</p> <p>Recommendation: Subject to independent WC assessments on D.fir and support of s 9(2)(a) (MPI), DOC and the Regional Council for the D.fir planting OR species substitution and lower WC score the Panel supported the 1BT-01304 application.</p> <p>1BT-01363 s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a). The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Panel queried: Would reversion meet the criteria of stems per hectare? s 9(2)(a) : Yes, and we have already requested extra photos.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01363 application.</p> <p>1BT-01446 Beckenham Hills</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a). The Panel discussed the application.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01446 application.</p> <p>1BT-01146 Tāne’s Tree Trust – Remeasurement of Northland Totara Forests</p> <p>This application was introduced by Lisette Rawson. The Panel discussed the application.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01146 application.</p> <p>1BT-00875 ECT Drone Seeding</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a). The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel queried: How far you can fly a drone under CAA rules i.e. the line of sight, and the impact of this limitation for aerial seeding. • The Panel queried: Using the contract to stage progress, e.g. evidence of seedlings propagating before moving to a second stage, releasing these for trial. • The Chair noted: Drones are going to be part of applications going forward, so this is the new reality. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00875 application, provided that seed balls are tested and CAA rules are adhered to.</p> <p>1BT-00767 Honey Forest Ruatahuna Tuhoe Tuawhenua Trust</p>

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- s 9(2)(a) : This project is a science project, looking at exploring the forest with Maori values, thereby aligning matauranga with Western science.
- **The Panel queried:** The value of the project, considering that the 1BT programme does not currently take matauranga values into account.
- **The Panel requested:** Acknowledgement that the project is supported from the Trust board.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-00767 application, provided that the request above is fulfilled.

1BT-01172 Puniu River Care Group

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- **The Panel queried:** The price of planting per hectare s 9(2)(a) : The planting compares well with other high value restoration projects, and it will enable the wider aspect of the programme.
- **The Panel queried:** The width of the setbacks and if they align with the new MfE freshwater strategy, i.e. 5 metres. s 9(2)(a) : The setbacks on these sites were generally larger as they were priority restoration sites i.e. greater than 10 metres.
- **The Panel requested:** Given Puniu River Care Group is working with Corrections, this arrangement should be covered off in any agreement to ensure protocols for having inmates on premises are being implemented. s 9(2)(a) : This will be addressed in the funding agreement.
- **The Panel queried:** The mix of tall tree species. s 9(2)(a) : There is an appropriate mix of tall tree species.
- **The Chair noted as a comment applying to all applications:** The Panel does not have the benefit of the knowledge gained by officials during the application process and applicant interactions. If the officials either support or have reservations about projects for reasons that are not in the paper, those reasons should be presented verbally to the Panel.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01172 application.

1BT-00495 NZDFI – Clonal propagation

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

- **The Panel noted:** The significant potential the project could bring to the industry and to NZ through import substitution of durable hardwood timbers.
- **The Panel noted:** NZDFI had acquired a lot of IP through the 10-years of research work that pre-dates the application and this should be reflected in the funding agreement to the benefit of the applicant. s 9(2)(a) : This will be addressed in the funding agreement.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-00495 application.

B. Smith left the meeting at 3.40pm

1BT-01519 BOPRC Priority Planting Project

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- **The Panel noted:** This model is similar to previous regional council proposals that have been received.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01519 application.

1BT-01056 Competenz Training Intervention Pilot – Forest harvesting

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- **The Panel noted:** This project is needed and the operator is a good one.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01056 application.

1BT-01535 FICA – The generation programme

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- **The Panel noted:** The applicant must have an independent assessment, which Te Uru Rākau needs to approve.
- **The Panel noted:** The applicant must have co-funding confirmed. There is no scope for increasing the 1BT funding other than to accommodate the independent assessment cost (that could cost up to \$5,000).
- **The Panel noted:** The applicant must discuss and seek Te Uru Rākau approval to change anything after approval.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01535 application, providing the above conditions are met.

Item	Minutes
	<p>1BT-01536 Rotary 100 Forest of Peace and Remembrance Project – Part 2</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel noted: This needs to be a staged project, walk before you run e.g. 200,000 trees in 2020 and come back if it works out. • The Panel queried: If the Rotary Peace, Remembrance and Community Trust are the right people to be partnering with? • The Panel noted: That there should be a condition to have an independent audit. □ The Panel noted: Council-owned sites are preferable. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01536 application, providing it is a staged project and there is an independent audit, as above.</p>
5.	<p>General Business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair confirmed: that future Panel meetings will not be fully catered unless they actually run over lunchtime. • The Panel agreed: that the next meeting will take place in Wellington but, with more of the team based in Rotorua, some future meetings will be run out of Rotorua. <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting is Thursday 30th January 2020.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



Date	Thursday 27 February 2020
Time	1.00pm – 4.00pm
Location	Te Uru Rākau, Level 1, 1 The Terrace, Wellington
Members	Peter Clark (Chair), Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Peter Ettema (Te Puni Kōkiri)
In Attendance	Henry Weston (Director, Forest Development, Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a) [Redacted]
Apologies	

Agenda.

Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome, introductions & minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Chair acknowledged that this was Peter Ettema and Henry Weston's first panel meeting.• The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

2.	<p>Conflict of Interest, Actions and Report Back</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters arising have all been dealt with, none to relitigate at this meeting • It was noted that Wellington suits the Panel as the meeting location for the present time. • Conflict of Interest register is a standing agenda item. The Panel was reminded to let s 9(2) know of any Conflicts of Interest. • New template for pack noted. • ACTION s 9(2)(a) to add a line in template for other stakeholders who may be interested in project. • ACTION: s 9(2)(a) to work with the Chair to go through closed items on the Action Point Register, and for future meetings, hide the closed items on the spreadsheet.
----	---

Item	Minutes
3.	<p>Grants Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 196 Grants in the pipeline from Entered to Recommendation. • There are 312 Grants approved, overall \$30.9 million or almost 16,000ha. • We are processing 64 live Grants. • We are awaiting further information on 60 Grants. • 72 Grants are in the contract phase, waiting return. • The recommendation process is being improved. • There is a project underway to simplify contract. • Milestone 2 – started a working group to ensure a consistent approach. There will be something in place over the next few weeks. • Review of existing enquiries that haven't applied to see if there is any opportunity to complete an application. • At a macro level, between Partnerships and Grants, there are commitments roughly equalling budget i.e. on track. • ACTION s 9(2)(a) to send the metrics that go to the 1BT Steering Group to the Panel with each meeting pack. • ACTION: E. Linforth-Hall to confirm the language used by MBIE when talking about grants to ensure consistency between MBIE and Te Uru Rākau (who currently use 'committed' and 'spent'.)

4.	<p>1BT Partnerships Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$90 million to commit in total, \$46.6 million absolutely committed, another \$3.8 million in post panel process. • Really pleased with progress, takes a while to get through panel through to decision maker, and then through to contract in place. • Update on Ngati Rehia: The Panel's recommendation was to fund \$5 million out of the approximate \$10 million asked for. This went to the Forestry Ministers with four options. The Ministers signed off \$6.25 million, and we are now working out how to roll that out. In parallel, PGF are also funding up to \$1.2 million to upgrade a tourist attraction in the area called Rewa's Village. We are working closely with the PDU as there are similar risks between the two projects around delivery. We are working out what level of support Te Uru Rākau needs to provide, keen to make it work.
----	--

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Rotary proposal: This was for \$1.3 million. This has been signed off by H. Weston and Julie Collins. • The videos which have been circulated to the Panel outlined the difference we are making with people. We are conscious of how we continue to get our work championed. • There is a paper going to Ministers who want us to be more proactive with catchment funding • Right Tree, Right Place which has already funded attracted huge feedback, and we are looking at if we should proactively be doing this for whole country. • Also looking at commissioning research into social benefits of funding. • The Panel queried: Is there a plan to collect the information we have so far from the fund, suite of applications received, stories etc and make available on website? s 9(2) [redacted]: Yes, we have a Knowledge Hub underway which will do this.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

5.

Applications presented to Panel:

1BT-01465 Rutherford & Dineen

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- **The Panel queried:** Why is there no wilding conifer score? s 9(2)(a) : This is usually prompted by a FALU advisor. It was not Douglas fir so didn't get a prompt. s 9(2)(a) : Any new forest planted under NES requires wilding conifer score. DoC is more than happy to assist with any GIS mapping required.
- **ACTION:** s 9(2)(a) will add in a bit into the template around regional council view.

Recommendation: Subject to the wilding conifer calculation, the Panel **supported** the 1BT01465 application in principle.

1BT-01566 Waitui Holdings

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- **The Panel queried:** Is there funding for pest control? s 9(2)(a) : The landowner, it is part of the grant and management plan.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01566 application.

1BT-01106 Hukarere Station

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

- **The Panel commented:** Make sure the fence does not go through areas of significance, and thereby compromising trees. This need to be made explicit in the planting plan. A buffer of taller material needs to be put around smaller species.
- **The Panel queried:** What is the other funding?
- **ACTION:** s 9(2)(a) will check and verify exactly what the potential source was.
- **The Chair commented:** Given that we haven't updated the material as at when the application was made, we are committed to the \$275,000.
- **ACTION:** s 9(2)(a) to have a conversation around how much of their project this covers, and find out if there is a way to do more with the funding.
- **The Chair asked:** Is there an official DoC view on eco sourcing?
- s 9(2)(a) Forestry Ministers decided that eco sourcing would be part of part of any project with ecological restoration (Nov 2018). Eco sourcing is the adopted standard at DoC. Keeping plants that have grown there in the past still growing there fits with climate, altitude etc. I would welcome what the Te Uru Rākau science team have to say about it. Essentially it is about protecting genetic integrity.
- **The Panel commented:** It comes back to what the objective of the programme is. If the objective is to create a native forest, then DoC's view will be that plants need to be ecologically sourced. If it is amenity planting, then that is a different equation. Eco sourcing will add a cost to the overall cost of the programme although scale will reduce this.
- s 9(2)(a) There is a forest milestone report from Scion on improving germination which I will share at a future meeting. They are making good progress with some interesting findings that can be taken back to industry.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01106 application, subject to determining if the planned spend of \$275,000 is a good use of money.

1BT-01306 NZFFA Cypress clones performance trials

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) **. The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.**

- **The Panel noted:** Our funding is coming in first for two years therefore we are the riskiest part of the project. At the end of two years there is no guarantee it will continue. s 9(2)(a) Yes, but good information will have been gained at the end of those two years.
- **The Panel queried:** If funding didn't come through 1BT, what would be the likelihood of this going ahead? s 9(2)(a) Cyprus research has stagnated since the 1980s and 90s, these organisations have no money.

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair commented: The way to protect access to the site is through a forestry right. Forestry rights can cover stuff like this, not just production. Through a forestry right, you could maintain access for research purposes. This mechanism is lodged against the title. In a legal sense, it separates the trees from the land. Without a forestry right, the trees remain with the land in terms of legal ownership. It lets you draw a line on a map to indicate, without a surveyor and is cheap to establish. The applicant holds the right. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01306 application.</p> <p>1BT-00974 NZFFA Cypress canker predictive model</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel commented: Trying to attribute dollar value to volunteers came up last year. Did we ever come up with a value on that or any consensus? s 9(2)(a) : We said all along that ‘in kind’ contribution can be part of it. If we have large amounts of volunteer time, we do need to attribute some value to that. We have taken a reasonable and consistent approach to that along the lines of minimum wage, and what they would pay if they had to go out and hire that labour. • The Panel noted: Regional councils capture a dollar amount when they run their contestable community fund. • ACTION: s 9(2)(a) will check with DoC and see what their dollar amount is. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00974 application.</p> <p>1BT-01584 SNIWC Wood is good education programme</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair noted: Education is a gap that Te Uru Rākau needs to address as forestry champions. • The Panel queried: How do you evaluate a programme like this? There is nothing in the application regarding how they are going to measure the programme’s success. What we are asked to fund is a whole lot of BAU stuff, are they short on money or is this an expansion thing, they want to do more of what they currently do? s 9(2)(a) : It is an expansion of the programme, and funding for a whole lot of material they need printed. • The Panel queried: Are they the best people to do this? There are others who do similar stuff. Have they explored having more of online presence? It would make sense if they’re trying to increase their reach. If this is going to be successful, it’s needs

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

to be woven in with other environmental programmes. Are the trucking industry putting anything into this? s 9(2)(a) : They are currently and they will be asked to contribute more.

- **The Panel queried:** Given the political environment we are operating in, how can we satisfy ourselves that material is not politicised? Balanced and factual material is a must. There needs to be a process. s 9(2)(a) : In the past we have insisted that we have sign off on the material.
- **The Panel queried:** Should the material be peer reviewed by the Ministry of Education? s 9(2)(a) I see no reason why not.
- **The Panel noted:** Long term, Te Uru Rākau needs to think about having a more proactive role. A much bigger conversation needs to happen within MPI about a wider primary sector education programme, rather than a one year programme such as this. It needs to have an evaluation programme.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01584 application, subject to inclusion of an evaluation component and visibility of the actual materials.

1BT-00638 Wildlands Plant for good

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) **. The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:**

- **The Panel commented:** There is a step above this, do we want to deliver 1BT grants via commercial third parties? If we want to do this, how would we know who is double dipping in the system? The system has been established so Te Uru Rākau can check the validity of where the grant money is going at the site level. This will diversify this process and let a private company do it, therefore Te Uru Rākau will lose control of delivery of the grant scheme.
- **The Panel noted:** A big risk will be the change from regional council perspective to having a preferred supplier.
- **The Panel acknowledged:** The website for Wildlands will change dramatically if this is funded.
- **The Panel summarised:** At its heart it is potentially paying just our normal rate to get a guaranteed supply of trees, accepting the risks that have been talked about we need to work through. Advice on legal and procurement is required, this needs work and thinking.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **deferred** the 1BT-00638 application.

1BT-00230 NZGHT Wetland margins planting

Item	Minutes
	<p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 9(2)(a) further noted: This is a similar project to the previous one, but is a not for profit who have been up and running for quite a long time and are very experienced in wetland protection. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00230 application, subject to advice from legal and procurement, and comfort about being able to monitor what is going on.</p> <p>1BT-01639 TreeMachine Stage 2 Forestry Training Courses</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel noted: The industry struggled to get people to plant trees, so spending some money to get people into these jobs seems a good thing. • The Panel noted: Other iwi would be excited to see this, how could we involve other iwi? • The Panel commented: There is some angst around this being a one off drop in the bucket. We have already funded these people. There is now a need to consider things like: why this programme; why here; why now; are we creating the legacy we want to; what is the lasting legacy for this apart from training 20 people at a really small cost; and, is this enough? • The Panel commented: The bigger critical issue is around how can we profile these programmes back to MoE and show that there is a hole in the training that needs to be looked at across government? At what stage does it transition to a social agency to take it on and what more do we need to prove before this happens? • The Panel advised: There needs to be a longer term view established on funding training programmes in the future. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00974 application.</p> <p>B. Smith left the meeting at 4pm.</p>
6.	<p>General Business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The Landcorp/Pāmu strategy had been circulated to the Panel and no comments or questions were received.
7.	<p>Strategy Discussion:</p>

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This discussion should probably be deferred. It is not really a Panel role, rather, the 1BT team have to get their head around the things which may influence applications for grants and partnerships that come through in the future. • The current Chair has only three remaining meetings left, May will be his last meeting. • ACTION: All Panel Members to think about independent, talented individuals that could come in to this role, preferable with forestry sector knowledge, and government knowledge would be helpful. • More consideration needs to be given to the benefits of what we are funding and what outcomes we are looking to achieve. We should not just be reporting on plants and hectares metrics, rather there needs to be a stronger assessment of the wider benefits and a better evaluation of what we have funded geographically fits in. There is a risk of coming to the end of the programme and not having a grasp of what the programme has actually done. • In the second half of the programme, we will not want to fund every project that meets the original criteria, and will need to start ranking projects. Ranking them will require some criteria on which to rank them, and we will then need to reflect this in the public facing side of things. We should not be funding everything that meets the criteria, we should be looking at the optimal mix, and the 1BT team has a role to help the panel understand what optimal means.
8.	<p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Next Meeting is Thursday 26th March 2020.</p>

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1992



Date	Thursday 26 March 2020
Time	9.30am – 12.30pm
Location	Via Skype
Members	Peter Clark (Chair), Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Peter Ettema (Te Puni Kōkiri)
In Attendance	Henry Weston (Director, Forest Development, Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Apologies	

Item	Minutes
1.	<p>Welcome, introductions & minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Chair welcomed s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] who will be taking over as Secretariat from the next meeting.• The Chair welcomed s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] as the Acting Manager of 1BT Partnerships• The Chair thanked s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] for her work as Manager of 1BT Partnerships to this point, and acknowledged her continuation in the Forest Development, Grants & Partnerships directorate in a new role.• The minutes were accepted, pending one small adjustment.• ACTION: s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] to make this adjustment to the minutes.
2.	<p>Conflict of Interest, Actions and Report Back</p> <p>□ P. Ettema noted that he is back working at MPI working on the drought and COVID-19 responses. He will seek clarification of his involvement in future Panel meetings.</p>

Agenda.

Item	Minutes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The actions from the last meeting were reviewed. The following actions are outstanding:• ACTION: s 9(2)(a) to check the addition of a line in template for other stakeholders who may be interested in project.• ACTION: s 9(2)(a) to work with the Chair to go through closed items on the Action Point Register, and for future meetings, hide the closed items on the spreadsheet.• ACTION: E. Linforth-Hall to confirm the language used by MBIE when talking about grants to ensure consistency between MBIE and Te Uru Rākau (who currently use 'committed' and 'spent'.)• ACTION: All Panel Members to think about independent, talented individuals that could come in to this role, preferably with forestry sector knowledge, and government knowledge would be helpful.• 1BT-01106 Hukarere Station was supported after the report back on the applicant's position re the necessity of the fencing top-up (information requested at the previous Panel meeting).• A. McDonald confirmed that no standard wage rate was used to put a value on volunteer work. The Chair advised: Going forward, we should use minimum wage to determine what volunteer contribution could be contracted at.• The Panel agreed to park '1BT-00638 Wildlands Plant for good' until next month.• H. Weston: The change in focus in the last couple of weeks will give us an opportunity to develop some criteria to gauge future applications by.• s 9(2)(a) noted her change in role included working closely with Ngati Rehia to manage the contract negotiations, risk mitigations and see it through. Any further questions on Ngati Rehia, please go directly to s 9(2)(a)• ACTION: H. Weston to send draft 12-month report that was sent to Minister Jones to panel members, which will provide a picture of the way forward.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

3.	<p>Forest Grants Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION: s 9(2)(a) will send a stats update to Panel with where things are sitting at the moment. • It is a 'Business As Usual' environment for the Forest Grants team. • Taking the opportunity to do a couple of key things over the next few weeks: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Go back over existing grants to make sure we have everything accurate, and ready to go when they can. 2. We are having to rethink some our processes in the current environment, making some changes working with FALU and Legal teams to progress these.
----	--

Item	Minutes
	<p>□ The Chair queried: Do you feel confident that your Pipeline is good enough to get back on track? s 9(2)(a) : Yes, I feel that we can, maybe not at the pace that I would like. COVID-19 has given us the opportunity to reshape some of our processes. Processes underway to minimise impact of the lags in the pipeline e.g. GIS capacity.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a) queried: Has Te Uru Rākau done any thinking about how the lockdown is going to affect seedling supplies? The Chair: Nurseries are OK to carry on with watering and fertilisation. Planting may be impacted. If we can't get going by 1 June, it will be a real issue. After four weeks, we will have a better sense of impacts.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a) queried: Has COVID-19 affected applications at all? s 9(2)(a) : Yes, if we are still in lockdown by May, I think we will see some impacts come through.</p> <p>A. McDonald: Given the All Of Government response to COVID-19, if there is a GIS need, would there be any value in Te Uru Rākau putting a request in for additional GIS staff, given that some people will be out of work? s 9(2)(a) : Will explore with Henry what we can do.</p>

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

4.

1BT Partnerships Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)

- Partnerships are presenting six applications to panel this month, totalling \$537,537. Three of these fall into the tree planting and large-scale restoration category, two are in the training category and one falls into the 'other' category.
- To date 56 Partnership Projects have been approved, totalling \$56.13 m. Should all six of these be approved, this will increase to \$56.66M. We are about \$4M from where we were hoping to be for March's target.
- Staff have been busy working on options for recovery following lock-down, with a number of opportunities within partnerships to move from community planting to paid labour opportunities. Two applications (Eastland Wood Council and Abushman) are part of the recently announced Tairawhiti recovery package and are presented to panel using a revised fast-track process, which will enable us to quickly move to contracting following this meeting. These two projects are consistent with the outcomes that the government wanted at the outset of the 1BT programme, with a specific requirement to create employment for displaced forestry workers in Tairawhiti. Regarding the query about can the training occur given lock-down, our focus is to get this ready for when restrictions are ended. This is something we've had to grapple with in the last seven days, as the shut-down advice was quickly implemented, up until then the priority was looking for work opportunities for those that were affected by the slowdown in China.

The Chair highlighted two significant Partnerships opportunities that could be replicated nationally, both broadly 'Right tree, right place':

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

1. The Perrin-Ag model, but involving Beef and Lamb, and the ability to extend to farmers through their ag consultants;
2. The Hawkes Bay model which looked at land use across the region, and which trees were best suited.

H. Weston agreed: These would get runs on the board with the rural community. It would take it from a scientific level to a tool that landowners can use. I see it as a priority to roll it out across the country.

ACTION: H. Weston to oversee the development of a paper to Te Uru Rākau's approach to cofunding for strategic projects, addressing issues like will it be treated as a partnership requirement (e.g. needing co-funding) or will be treated more like a contract relationship via operational budget? We would be commissioning a significant piece of nationwide applied research, might get some co-funding from regional councils, but could we relax the co-funding element? H. Weston to report back on progress to next panel so the Panel can have a discussion on what co-funding approach is best to take for strategically important projects.

5.

Applications presented to Panel:

1BT-01474 Brams Run Pine

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- **The Panel queried:** Do we know of any run off or water volume issues in the catchment? s 9(2)(a) : The afforestation will help minimise the risk of erosion and sediment run off into the river.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01474 application.

1BT-01509 Glenyre The Doone

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.

- **The Panel noted:** It is better to have an independent wilding assessment as the score was 11. Also make sure the reversion is applicable in this area. It would be helpful if the applicant's name and address was listed so we could get more detail. s 9(2)(a) : ECan will probably do their own assessment.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01509 application, subject to having an independent wilding assessment, making sure the reversion is applicable and listing the applicant's name and address, as noted above.

Item	Minutes
	<p>1BT-01531 Glenbrook Exotic Panel</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel queried: Why pine and not native for this permanent forest? The Chair: Native would be more expensive. There is a short term incentive in the ETS to do exotics. • Area vs number of trees metrics? Number of trees is the metric we need in the dashboard. Both metrics are used – we talk and pay in hectares, when it gets to Ministerials, we talk about number of trees. The Chair: There is an exercise to get it into a shape that we all understand. • ACTION: s 9(2)(a) to bring standardised data to next meeting. • The Panel commented: Government desire to create a dryland park in McKenzie country, also government investment in wilding conifer control. How would this impact on water and water quality? As this is a permanent forest, does it make it exempt from wilding conifer control/calculator? s 9(2)(a) : Yes, under the NES it has to be commercial and harvested, this isn't going to be. • How will the exotic plantation transition to permanent indigenous in such a dry environment? No information provided. • The Chair: There is enough concern here, a few things building on each other. I think we have to know a bit more about this application, there are a few negatives. Put it on hold until we know more. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel deferred the 1BT-01531 application.</p> <p>1BT-01646 South Waikato District Council</p> <p>This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a) . The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel queried: How long does the funding from Oji last? s 9(2)(a) : Long-term, but no exact details on how long this goes for, but definitely goes beyond three years of this contract. • The Panel suggested: Add in stop-go that the contract goes so long as the Oji money keeps coming through. Add in consultation with TPK office in Hamilton. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01646 application.</p>

Item	Minutes
------	---------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

1BT-00622 HBRC Regional planting Year 1

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a). The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** How do we factor in co-funding from landowners and in a drought? s 9(2)(a) Landowners are paid as they order and plant, money will be released. Two year programme to allow for these delays.

The Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-00622 application.

1BT-00961 Nga Puna Rau o Rangitikei additional capacity

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a). The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel queried:** Are we OK with lower levels of co-funding on this application? Is project still viable if funding doesn't arrive? s 9(2)(a): Some/all will be able to be progressed.
- **The Panel queried:** Is there an opportunity to say our funding is approved in principle if other funding comes on board? **H. Weston:** Ideal is that our \$30k is focussed on what it will take to plant a bunch of trees. It should be easy to find another \$20k from other funds, e.g. MFE.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-00961 application, i.e. progress with \$30k and no co-funding, but with project manager seeking to secure additional funding as part of the project management deliverables.

The following two projects have been developed under urgency for the Tairāwhiti support package.

1BT-01792 Eastland Wood Council & Abushman

These applications were introduced by s 9(2)(a). The Panel discussed the applications and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel noted:** The focus should be on how many people are trained, new young recruits.

Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel **supported** the 1BT-01792 and Abushman applications.

1BT-01576 South Taranaki District Council Tree Planting

This application was introduced by s 9(2)(a). The Panel discussed the application and focused on the following key issues:

- **The Panel commented:** Might struggle with 2020 planting, but contract can accommodate this. s 9(2)(a): We could increase the contract, but would


Item	Minutes
	<p>need capacity - would this be OK to treat via contract variation rather than need to come back to panel? The Chair: Agreed that given the small size of the project the project size could be increased by a doubling or triple without coming back to Panel. However he noted that financial provision would most likely be needed for a longer maintenance period. Two years probably not enough, better to be three to five years of maintenance and increase total funding requirements accordingly).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Panel advised: Noting the comments regarding experience in delivering the project, perhaps discuss with an ecologist rather than parks and landscaping team to get ecological understanding of the risks and the opportunities with the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01576 application, subject to advice from an ecologist as above.</p>
6.	<p>General Business:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None – just strategic projects to progress, as discussed.</p>
7.	<p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Next Meeting is Thursday 30th April 2020.</p>

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



One Billion Trees Fund Advisory Panel

Meeting Minutes

Date	Thursday, 30 April 2020
Time	9:30am – 12:30pm
Chair	Peter Clark
Members	Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Sam Johnson (Te Puni Kōkiri), Peter Ettema (Manager, International Environment, MPI)
Apologies	
Attendees	Henry Weston (Director, Forestry Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a) 

Key points, decisions and actions

Item	Discussion
1.	Welcome, introductions & minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Chair welcomed Sam Johnson who will be taking over from Peter Ettema for Te Puni Kōkiri from the next meeting noting also that Peter Ettema, now engaged by MPI, will remain a panel member.• The prior meeting's minutes were accepted as true and correct.
2.	Conflict of Interest, Actions and Report Back <ul style="list-style-type: none">• S. Johnson noted that he knows Delaraine of Te Orewai Te Horo Trust.• The actions from the last meeting were reviewed. All actions have been closed.• 1BT-01531 Glenbrook Exotic – has been pulled from Panel as it needs an all of government approach. <p>Agreed actions: s 9(2)(a) to communicate with the applicant of Glenbrook that we will be taking a different approach to be consistent with national policies around aesthetics and wildings.</p>

3.	<p>1BT – Supporting Post Covid Recovery Future Direction: Henry Weston</p> <p>Henry presented his paper that is a response to the government’s approach to fast-tracking expenditure that can support employment, economic activity and good environmental outcomes as part of COVID recovery. Henry sought Panel member feedback, particularly where we should be focusing, where we are missing stuff, other opportunities or risks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel agreed in principle with the key points made in the paper. Discussion focused on how best to implement those points including engagement with farmers, non-wood forest products, revisiting historic applications that may qualify for consideration in the post covid19 environment, co-funding ratio and timing of payments. • The Panel agreed it was sensible to deal with some matters by email between formal monthly meetings where this would help progress applications. <p>Agreed actions: With the panels endorsement the paper is to be put to the minister for consideration. Panel members were asked to alert their respective organisations to the content of the paper.</p>																				
4.	<p>Forest Grants Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="323 757 1139 1200"> <tr> <td>Total Enquiries for Month</td> <td>61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resulting in Applications</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Value of Applications</td> <td>\$3,260,423</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Native</td> <td>27.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Exotic</td> <td>37.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Reversion</td> <td>35.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total in Pipeline</td> <td>166</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total In Review</td> <td>122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Awaiting Customer Response</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average Age of In Review in Weeks</td> <td>14.5</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GIS resourcing is an ongoing issue. Covid has limited GIS output to 50% due to data draw into home-based PCs. Improved in the last week with better tech and systems. Average 14 weeks which is well in excess of the 8 weeks touted on the website. A lot of work to do in that area. • The Chair queried at the last meeting s 9(2)(a) suggested there might be spare capacity in DOC GIS. Have you had a look at the s 9(2)(a) confirmed she had a discussion with s 9(2) and we expect to have resourcing resolved by the next panel meeting. 	Total Enquiries for Month	61	Resulting in Applications	28	Total Value of Applications	\$3,260,423	% Native	27.5%	% Exotic	37.2%	% Reversion	35.3%	Total in Pipeline	166	Total In Review	122	Total Awaiting Customer Response	44	Average Age of In Review in Weeks	14.5
Total Enquiries for Month	61																				
Resulting in Applications	28																				
Total Value of Applications	\$3,260,423																				
% Native	27.5%																				
% Exotic	37.2%																				
% Reversion	35.3%																				
Total in Pipeline	166																				
Total In Review	122																				
Total Awaiting Customer Response	44																				
Average Age of In Review in Weeks	14.5																				
5.	<p>1BT Partnerships Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 applications to discuss with panel to a total of \$5,200,000 – 2 seedling & labour workforce category, 1 training category and 3 in the catchment scale native restoration support category. • Tracking at 62 partnership projects approved totalling \$57.4m. If these 6 progress to the next phase looking at \$62.6m. 3 of these applications are verbal updates. Awhitu Peninsula project is in a new buildable template format – part of an initiative to drive decision making right through the process to reducing processing time from months to weeks. 																				

Applications presented to panel

Item	Discussion
------	------------

1.	<p>1BT-01602 Restoration Chatham Islands Nursery Collective – Clayton Wallwork The Panel discussed the application and focused on scale and number of nurseries, the relationship with the existing DOC nursery, the nursery skills and training, funding beyond 1BT and risk mitigation.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01602 application, subject to building in monitoring into the funding agreement.</p>
2.	<p>The following two projects have been developed under urgency for the Tairāwhiti redeployment package and were presented verbally by s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED].</p> <p>1BT- 01823 s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] – Jogging for Logging (Tu Te Ora)</p> <p>The Panel discussed the application and focused on how it fits 1BT criteria, funding beyond 1BT and potential support from Trust Tairāwhiti and TPK.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT- 01823 application.</p> <p>1BT -01868 Ūawanui Project</p> <p>The Panel discussed the application and focused on the trust capability, land title status, infrastructure and seedling source. E. Linforth-Hall wished to check that this project aligned with another PGF funded project Ūawanui applied for.</p> <p>The Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01868 application.</p>
3.	<p>1BT 00453 Te Orewai Te Horo Trust – s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]</p> <p>The Panel discussed the application and focused on the trust deed, the changes to the trustees, the proposed budget and co-funding and training support for governance.</p> <p>The Panel suggested for this and other 1BT funded nurseries we include a clause in the funding agreement that restricts use of the seedlings produced to the applicant’s own Iwi lands or the 1BT funded project as the case may be, with the intent that these government supported start-up nurseries are not competing directly with private commercial nurseries for planting outside of their own lands.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT 00453 application</p>
4.	<p>1BT 01697 Tupu Ake Evolution – s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]</p> <p>The Panel discussed the application and focused on why ongoing funding was not coming from HPR and the rationale for 1BT support.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT 01697 application.</p>
5.	<p>1BT-001436 Te Korowai o Papatuanuku, Awhitu Peninsula Project – s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]</p> <p>This application was introduced in a streamlined new format as a test case for a new standard going forward.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the application and focused on the stocking rate, the cooperation of other entities, the budget, the outcomes we were funding, competition with commercial nurseries and the need to restrict nursery sales to the Awhitu Peninsula project.</p>
	<p>The panel supported the format of the presentation subject to the recommendations being moved to the beginning of the paper.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-001436 application.</p>

General Business

Item	Discussion
1.	s 9(2)(a) updated the panel on the Wildlands project and clarified there were no legal impediments. The Chair was happy to progress this by email if there are decisions ready to be made prior to the next advisory panel meeting.
2.	s 9(2)(a) updated the panel on the progress of the historic Motutapu Island Project application noting that the contracting party is now to be only Ngai Tai Tamaki. The Panel were happy with and the intent that they keep collaborating with Motutapu Restoration Trust and DOC.

Details of next meeting

Date	28/05/2020	Time	9:30am – 12:30pm
Venue	Skype – details to be provided		

Minutes approved:

Peter Clark, Chair


12 May 2020

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



One Billion Trees Fund Advisory Panel

Meeting Minutes

Date	Thursday, 28 May 2020
Time	9:30am – 1:30pm
Chair	Peter Clark
Members	Eliot Linforth-Hall (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Sam Johnson (Te Puni Kōkiri), Peter Ettema (Manager, International Environment, MPI)
Apologies	Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment)
Attendees	Henry Weston (Director, Forestry Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a) 

Key points, decisions and actions

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>Welcome, introductions & minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Chair confirmed the panel meeting recordings are to be kept for 7 days for the purpose of accurate minutes. The recording will then be deleted. The recording is not for public record and he encouraged staff to take their own notes on the relevant projects.• Alan McDonald advised that the sharefile links are time limited, and if panel members wish to go back to previous panel packs or minutes they are unable to. He asked if the time limit can be removed.• The prior meeting's minutes were accepted as true and correct. With the key points Alan McDonald raised after the last panel meeting to be incorporated into this month's minutes. <p>Agreed actions: Secretariat to look into the sharefile time limits and if that can be removed.</p>
2.	<p>Conflict of Interest, Actions and Report Back</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Chair advised of his conflicts of interest on two projects, these have been recorded in the panel register with the ID numbers 1BT-COI-015 and 1BT-COI-016. The Chair excused himself from the Panel meeting for items 19 and 20.• Sam Johnson advised a conflict of interest on the paper 1BT-01879 as he has a minor relationship with Tapuwae group. The conflict has been noted as ID number 1BT-COI-017.• The actions from the last meeting were reviewed. All actions have been closed.

3.	Forest Grants Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)		
	Previous Month in Review		
	Total Enquiries for Month	76	
	2020 Average Monthly Enquiries	60	
	Total Applications for Month	53	
	Total Value of Applications for Month	\$11,051,343	
	% Native	41.0%	
	% Exotic	50.8%	
	% Reversion	8.2%	
	Overall Grants View	Total	Value
	Total Active Grants	174	\$39,653,286
	Currently being worked on	132	\$29,326,660
	Awaiting Customer Response	42	\$10,326,626
	GIS resourcing is an ongoing issue. Some of the work has been outsourced to Orbica and FALU. The admin staff will also be trained, the additional support should resolve the bottleneck.		
4.	1BT Partnerships Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 applications to discuss with panel to a total of \$24,000,000. • Tracking at 64 partnership projects approved totalling \$56.54m. 19 further partnership applications have been recommended for approval. 			

Applications presented to panel

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>1BT-00948 - Manukau Land Trust Planting / Maui Solomon - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Application for planting 150.55 hectares on the Chatham Islands which includes 140.18 hectares of indigenous species and 10.37 hectares of eucalypts for a total award of \$856,635 which includes a base grant of \$576,275, a High Land Prep/Surge region top-up of \$70,090 and an Ecological top-up of \$210,270.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the logistics of transport and seedlings, biosecurity, pest management, bringing in labour from the mainland and the effect that will have on the budget, and the coordination of a wider strategy across the Chatham Islands with a whole of government approach to delivery. • The Chair pointed out that one agency will need to take a leading role to coordinate this approach and suggested s 9(2)(a) and Henry Weston look at how this can be managed. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00948 application, subject to the cautions raised with regards to overlapping of different projects and funding across the island.</p>

2.	<p>1BT-01550 - Becroft Heath Family Trust Lowry Peak Planting / Paul Becroft - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>This project is the planting of 264.97 hectares as a permanent forest in Canterbury which includes 249.82 hectares of exotics (radiata and eucalypts) as well as 15.15 hectares of native species for funding of \$554,690.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the timing for entry into the ETS, the risk around the use of eucalypts in a fire risk area, the public perception of the project and the mitigation of wilding.
	<p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01550 application.</p>
3.	<p>1BT-01531 - Glenbrook / Simpson Williamson and Keenan Exotic Planting - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>This project was deferred from last month's Panel due to two environmental issues raised namely the impact on McKenzie Basin "Dryland Park" and the Wilding Assessment. The funding requested is \$612,420.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the resource consent requirement, landscape architecture, NESPF criteria and the area of the planting that will qualify for ETS. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01531 application, subject to securing the necessary consents from the District and Regional Councils.</p>
4.	<p>1BT-01314 - TDC Tasman Fires Indigenous Planting Restoration - s 9(2)(a) (Shovel ready project)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of \$3,059,200 over 3 years to deliver 111ha of indigenous planting on fire damaged land in the Tasman Region. The purchase of approximately 460,000 seedlings and the creation of 7 FTE roles – 1 project manager, and 6 planting roles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the need for a qualified project manager, running a tender to invite experts to fill the roll and whether the budget includes site preparation and seedling maintenance. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01314 application.</p>
5.	<p>1BT-01505 & 1BT-01506 - Te Pōhā o Murihikunui - Southland - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>A briefing for a 1BT investment of \$2.4 million over 3 years for planting 100ha of Waituna estuary and surrounding habitat on Maori land, training 30 rungatahi with NZQA qualifications, employment of 40 FTE's and building 4 native seedling nurseries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the applications and focused on the nursery being only a small part of the budget, TPK providing a business case for training and employment numbers, the long term governance arrangements, sustainability of the employment, linkages to Thriving Southland and the risks of overlap in funding. • The Chair queried whether the training programme can provide a pathway into forestry long-term, what the long-term plan was for the nurseries once planting is completed and suggested that the two large private commercial nurseries (Liethfield and Edendale) plus any smaller Southland private native nurseries be consulted to confirm that their business will not be negatively impacted. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01505 and 1BT-01506 applications, subject to a more detailed plan being put together.</p>

<p>6.</p>	<p>1BT-01939 - Kaiate Falls planting project - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment of \$302,400 over 2 years to deliver 58,000 native plants across 9ha of high priority land to directly mitigate the impacts of pastoral activities and the restoration of the Kaiate Falls swimming hole, creation of 7-8 FTEs in conjunction with BOPRC to commence within a 0-3 month timeframe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the setbacks from the stream, whether the planting will achieve the goal without the need for further land use changes and the possibility of the landowner receiving a subsidy and ETS if more of the farm is planted in hardwoods to further mitigate surface run off. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01939 application.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>1BT-01951 - BOPRC extension programmes for riparian, gully and wetland restoration projects - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment of \$498,000 over 2 years to support high priority works that don't fit within BOPRC policy frameworks, focusing on native tree planting and associated works on Maori owned land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the selection process and how 1BT will be involved with where the funding is allocated, reporting and clarity of the outcomes, engagement with Maori landowners, good representation of hapu/iwi and their involvement in the project governance groups. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01951 application, subject to further clarity on the reporting and selection process.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>1BT-01935 - Ngati Haua Mahi Trust - Karapiro catchment project - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment of \$637,500 over 3 years for 24ha of retired wetland and riparian margins on highly erodible land, 30km of fencing, weed control and a training programme to develop capability for Ngati Haua.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on landowner agreements and availability of resources and seedling supply. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01935 application.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>1BT-01934 - Manaia River sub catchment restoration project - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment of \$1,005,592 over 3 years for the restoration of the Coromandel Peninsula harbour, establishing a local native nursery for eco-sourced seedlings, creation of 5.85 FTE and training opportunities for local iwi.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the first stage being investigation, the use of Glyphosate to clear paspalum and kikuyu in the area, sustainability of the employment after the 3 years and how to keep iwi engaged in the long term. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01934 application.</p>

<p>10.</p>	<p>1BT-01930 - Clean Streams Riparian Restoration project - s 9(2)(a) (Led by s 9(2)) This paper seeks feedback on the Waikato Regional Council for the Clean Streams 2020 – Waikato Region Riparian Restoration project for a maximum total investment of \$5,100,000 over three years to supply and plant 1,020,000 native plants, 408km riparian fencing and a total of 40 FTEs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the scale, uncertainty of uptake, how an influx of applications would be triaged, the statutory obligations of the WRC, the Tainui settlement and the risks around landowners paying for fencing. • The Panel discussed reducing the funding to \$2m over a 2 year period and requested that the proposal be reworked with WRC to a more short-term scope with a view to revisit. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01930 application up to \$2 million, subject to the level of uptake in the first year.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>1BT-01793 - University of Canterbury - Restoration Ambassador Contract extension - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment of \$423,000 over 12 months to create 3 positions, one employing s 9(2)(a) full time and two junior roles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the milestones and tracking progress, reducing Adam's hourly rate to a more reasonable level, targeting remote
	<p>areas, reporting on outputs, where the contract sits and whether it was interrupting an existing market.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01793 application, subject to a reduced hourly rate and reporting outcomes being addressed.</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>1BT-01874 - Te Mata Park Re-vegetation Programme Trust - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for the Te Mata Park Re-Vegetation Programme project, to a maximum value of \$601,876. This project will result in the planting of 59,000 native seedlings over 12 hectares of land adjoining Te Mata Peak Park which was recently purchased by the Te Mata Park Trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and no matters were raised. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01874 application.</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>1BT-01858 - On Farm Research - Poplar - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>This paper seeks Panel support to progress to negotiating a Funding Agreement with On Farm Research for the Accelerating poplar plantings on the East Coast project, to a maximum value of \$190,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on whether this research was already done, if this was a literature review and suggested follow up with Landcare and NZ Poplar and Willow Trust on whether the research is available. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel did not support the 1BT01858 application.</p>

<p>14.</p>	<p>1BT-01672 - Ngati Makino iwi Authority - Catchment planting - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment of \$5,112,480 for the Waitahanui Riparian project - Te Mahere Ruataki Pāhekoheko o Waitahanui. The funding requested will be used to support project coordination, fencing and tree planting activities across 102ha and involving 699,388 native seedlings in the Waitahanui Catchment on the northern shores of Lakes Rotoehu and Rotoma. The planting area extends from the Waitahanui headwaters (Ngā Kuha O Mākino) to the mouth of the Waitahanui River adjacent to Otamarakau marae</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on concerns around locking up \$5m into an undeveloped project, conflicts with exotic forest and harvesting, concerns around governance, predator control, quality assurance, employment requirements, whether employing Wildlands was a good option or whether an independent project manager would be more suitable, seedling supply, the land that can be obtained from Timberlands and whether we could fund consultancy work and then bring the project back to panel. • s 9(2)(a) advised that GIS mapping had been completed on the 68ha of their own land which is shovel ready with seedlings to be provided by Minginui Nursery. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel suggested going back to the applicant and putting together a proposal for planting on Ngati Makino owned land over a 3 year period then bringing it back to Panel.</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>1BT-01879 - Tapuwae Seed Survey - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment of \$74,340 over 18 months to survey plant species across 4 Maori land blocks totalling 716ha in North Hokianga to assist in planning restoration efforts in erosion zones, wetlands and riparian areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on any competition with nurseries, completing an environmental plan and suggestions to link in with David Bergin and local botanical society. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01879 application.</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p>1BT-01862 - Hokianga Harbour Care Incorporated - s 9(2)(a) (Shovel ready project)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment of \$295,906 over 3 years for the Hokianga Planting project with Hokianga Harbour Care Incorporated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on ensuring confidence in governance and management. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01862 application.</p>
<p>17.</p>	<p>1BT-01814 - AgResearch Development of a Silvopastoral module - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment in AgResearch for the Development of a Silvopastoral module project, to a maximum value of \$400,000 to weigh costs and benefits across sheep and beef farms for scattered planting rather than block planting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on sub-optimised income from pasture and forest, how the tool will be used, the links into the farm ETS work, proof of concept, and protection of a stop/go being written into the contract. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01814 application, subject to proof of concept and clarification of how the deployment of the tool will occur.</p>

18.	<p>1BT-01960 - KTM silviculture training programme - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment in the Silviculture training programme, to a maximum value of \$200,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on whether there is an overlap between cohorts and whether it needs to be subject to 15 people signing up. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01960 application.</p>
19.	<p>1BT-01723 - Scion National right tree right place project - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment in the extension of the Right Tree Right Place Hawkes Bay pilot program and taking it nationwide to a maximum value of \$1 million.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the availability and access of the tool, iwi involvement, the lack of trees for the amount funded, where the tool is best hosted, and whether 100% funding can be justified. The panel requested outcomes of the Hawkes Bay project. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel deferred the application to the June panel.</p>
20.	<p>1BT-02002 – TK Dewes - Supporting increased Māori participation in forestry - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment in a scoping study to establish a business entity to commercialise Maori land blocks, refocusing priorities in Maori engagement and developing land into forestry for \$15,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on linking it into existing projects, defining the scope and specific deliverables, conducting it as a feasibility study, and suggested giving TK Dewes access to the outcomes of previous project work. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-02002 application, subject to clarifying the scope and outputs.</p>
21.	<p>COVID-19 recovery science paper - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment for increasing resilience due to climate change, covid19 impacts and planting delays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on whether the research has already been done, how it will be made available to stakeholders, the lack of detail and conflicting results from the peer reviewers, whether it is information dissemination rather than a science project, the timeframes and if it can be scaled back. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the concept of covid recovery research provided it met the needs of the smaller forest owners and nurseries and engaging a reviewer from the nursery sector and Farm Forestry Association. There was a call from the panel members for more work to be done on the research outputs and intended stakeholder access to that knowledge.</p>

General Business

Item	Discussion
1.	The Chair announced that he will be leaving MPI but has taken on a consultancy role to continue on as Chair of the Panel and will still be available to provide advice on applications as they are being assessed by staff.

Details of next meeting

Date	25/06/2020	Time	9:30am – 12:30pm
Venue	Skype – details to be provided		

Minutes approved:
Peter Clark, Chair
08/06/2020

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



One Billion Trees Fund Advisory Panel

Out-of-cycle Meeting Minutes

Date	Friday, 12 June 2020 Note: This meeting was not physically convened but involved the Chair meeting with staff, providing e-mail context for Panel Members and e-mail and telephone feedback from Panel Members.
Chair	Peter Clark
Members	Eliot Linforth-Hall (Investment Director, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Sam Johnson (Principal Advisor, Te Puni Kōkiri), Peter Ettema (Manager, International Environment, MPI)
Apologies	
Attendees	Henry Weston (Director, Forestry Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a) [Redacted]

Applications presented to panel

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>1BT – Catchment Group Funding – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>This paper seeks your support in-principle for the 11 catchment groups presented in this briefing, with \$10m to be funded through the 1BT Catchment Group and the difference to be funded through the Partnerships fund, or other funding avenues to be determined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Panel discussed the application and focused on the sums requested and what we would actually be funding, how we ensure that the funds go where they are targeted, the likelihood of risk mitigation with farmers undertaking fencing and weed control and co-contributions, and ensuring that projects are phased realistically.The Chair advised that it will be important to maintain a communication lines with NZPPI and NZ Forest Nursery Growers Association and to feed back to Panel any concerns emerging around oversupply or subsidised competition with the private nurseries. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the paper subject to due diligence on the applicants and clarity on the specifics of outputs (what we are buying).</p>

2.	<p>1BT-01995 - Te Toa Whenua Nursery Manager – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Te Roroa Development Charitable Trust (the Trust) aims to plant 200ha in native seedlings, using seedlings generated by its own nursery. The Trust is now applying to the 1BT Fund for</p>
	<p>an investment of \$286,440 over three years to employ a nursery manager (0.95 FTE) and a nursery kaimahi (0.75 FTE)</p> <p>□ The Panel discussed the application and had no concerns.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01995 application subject to due diligence on the applicant.</p>
3.	<p>1BT-000480 – Trees for Survival – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of up to \$440,090 over one year to deliver the planting of 80,000 seedlings, restocking existing shade houses in 10 schools for a targeted 118,000 seedlings for 2021; and the establishment of a role to focus on generating sustainable support in the future.</p> <p>□ The Panel discussed the application and focused on the monitoring of past planting, weed and pest control, ensuring stock exclusion. It's great that students are involved but does that meet employment/covid recovery criteria and what plans are in place to ensure sustainability past the first year.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00480 application, subject to addressing sustainability post 1BT funding and satisfaction on the plans and funding to ensure post-plant seedling maintenance and survival.</p>
4.	<p>1BT-02053 – NZPPI Additional Capacity – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of \$11,500 over 1 month to engage a consultant to provide the additional capacity required to develop a business plan to deliver NZPPI's various strategic plans to address research, capacity and capability issues within their sector.</p> <p>□ The Panel discussed the application and had no concerns.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-02053 application.</p>
5.	<p>1BT-01723 – Scion Right Tree Right Place – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>A progress update on the Scion Right Tree Right Place application discussed at the 28 May 2020 Panel meeting. Proposal for 1BT investment in the extension of the Right Tree Right Place Hawkes Bay pilot program and taking it nationwide to a maximum value of \$1 million.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the applications and commented that it seemed to be a courtesy progress update rather than answering the various questions. • The Chair confirmed his conflict of interest and stepped away from this paper. <p>Recommendation: The Panel noted that Te Uru Rakau had elected to progress this project and raised no objection, simply requesting that the reservations and questions raised at the 28 May Panel meeting are addressed.</p>

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

6.	<p>1BT-PDU – Joint Riparian Projects – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>This paper seeks your in-principle approval for investment in four ‘PDU worker redeployment initiatives – fencing of waterways’ proposals. This paper presents the funding related to the One Billion Trees criteria as part of the overall project proposal. The total maximum value of investment from One Billion Trees Partnerships across the four projects is \$4,241,513.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The Panel discussed the application and focused on how to contract and administer these in an “applicant-friendly” manner given the dual funding sources and reporting lines to PDU and Te Uru Rakau <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-PDU application subject to the conditions PDU has placed on the applicants.</p>
-----------	---

2

7.	<p>COVID-19 recovery science paper - s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for 1BT investment for increasing resilience due to climate change, covid19 impacts and planting delays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the limited information presented, whether the proposed science projects will verify institutional knowledge that already exists and enhance it to make it more robustly based than simple observations over time. • The Panel noted the skills of the 1BT Strategic Science Advisory Group (SSAG) and asked that this group remain involved as the science projects are refined, in particular for fit with industry needs, and extension of results to the target users of the knowledge. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the Covid-19 recovery science paper application.</p>
-----------	---

Details of next meeting

Date	25/06/2020	Time	9:30am – 12:30pm
Venue	Skype – details to be provided		

Minutes approved:

Peter Clark, Chair

18/06/2020

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 2082

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



One Billion Trees Fund Advisory Panel

Meeting Minutes

Date	Thursday 25 June 2020.
Time	9:30am – 11:30am
Chair	Peter Clark
Members	Eliot Linforth-Hall (Investment Director, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Sam Johnson (Principal Advisor, Te Puni Kōkiri),
Apologies	Peter Ettema (Manager, International Environment, MPI)
Attendees	Henry Weston (Director, Forestry Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a)

Key points, decisions and actions

Item	Discussion												
1.	<p>Welcome, introductions & minutes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The meeting minutes for both 28 May 2020 and the out of cycle panel meeting were accepted as true and correct.</p>												
2.	<p>Conflict of Interest, Actions and Report Back</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The actions from the last meeting were reviewed. All actions have been closed.</p>												
3.	<p>Forest Grants Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Previous Month in Review</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total Enquiries for Month</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Applications</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Value of Applications</td> <td>\$2,550,530</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Native</td> <td>34.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Exotic</td> <td>61.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Previous Month in Review		Total Enquiries for Month	82	Total Applications	47	Total Value of Applications	\$2,550,530	% Native	34.4%	% Exotic	61.2%
Previous Month in Review													
Total Enquiries for Month	82												
Total Applications	47												
Total Value of Applications	\$2,550,530												
% Native	34.4%												
% Exotic	61.2%												

% Reversion	4.5%
Total Enquiries for Month	82
Total in Pipeline	154
Actively working	127

Awaiting Customer	27
Total Contracts Last Month	43
Total Value of Contracts	\$4,987,855
Employment FTE	3.81

GIS resourcing is an ongoing issue. 4 FTE have been out in applications getting through faster. Last month 90 applications, this month we are down to 47 applications sitting with them.

4.	<p>1BT Partnerships Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A total of 88 Partnership Projects have been approved, which totals \$69.32 m. Thirteen further partnership projects are currently recommended for approval or are under review by decision makers, these projects total an additional \$12.09m Partnerships are discussing 2 applications with panel this month, totalling \$2,030,000. We also have an update on the Motutapu Restoration Project from s 9(2). This project was approved in 2018, put on hold, recast and re-negotiated from March 2020.
-----------	---

Applications presented to panel

Item	Discussion
------	------------

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

<p>1.</p>	<p>1BT-0115 – Kōwhairoa Peninsula Historic Reserve Biodiversity Restoration Project– s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of up to \$1,835,000 over four years to deliver the seed collection, propagation and planting of up to 135,000 native plants across a proposed 110.5 hectares of the peninsula; up to a total of 12 roles over the duration of the project made up of part and full time roles and the construction of a Whare Kākano onsite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the four year timeframe, double dipping, species selection, ongoing pest control and maintenance, use of commercial nursery, biodiversity survey, the location of the shade house, the benefits of funding the 69ha over the 110ha, the logistics costs and the high cost of items listed in the budget. • The Chair advised that the application is supported however the budget needs to be looked at carefully, possibly by a professional, to work the costs from the ground-up as the budget seems too high. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-0115 application subject to the following actions being completed.</p> <p>Agreed Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compare costs to quotes from commercial nursery and fair labour productivity rates for planting, and 2. Ground-up costing. Collect 150,000 worth of seed, from these species, here is how long it takes to collect this; and 3. Clarity on cost make-up for seed collection and propagation, logistics and labour 4. Species selection and water availability for plants once planted 5. Baseline biodiversity survey
<p>2.</p>	<p>TUR 1BT_2018_010 - The Motutapu Land Restoration (Hukunui) Project – s 9(2) (a)</p> <p>The Project focuses on tribal-led restoration of the mauri of Motutapu through the planting of up to 123,200 trees and shrubs, across 28 hectares of whenua at Hukunui. The project duration</p>
	<p>is three years. Verbal update on changes to the contracted party being only Te Haerenga o Nga Tai ki Tamaki Limited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The Panel supported the variation to the applicant of the funding agreement.

<p>3.</p>	<p>1BT-01823 - Tu Te Ora – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of up to \$195,000 over one year a health and wellbeing centre for kaimahi in the forestry sector; an 8 week challenge that includes wānanga, Te Whare Tapa Wha, mindfulness exercises and nutritional information, and provide EAP service to companies and kaimahi.</p> <p>□ The Panel discussed the application and focussed on whether it's better funded by MoH, the fit to 1BT criteria, certainty of continuation post funding, business case for mental health to be much stronger, purpose of the vehicle, employer/contractor support, and rigour/structure around wellness and mental health.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel did not reach a decision on the 1BT-01823 application and requested the following actions to be completed and reported back before a decision can be reached.</p> <p>Agreed Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update costings - remove car 2. Obtain testimonials from contractor companies and individuals that have completed the training and how it has improved their wellbeing and performance 3. Background on the need for such a programme that is specific to forest industry 4. Obtain endorsements from contractor and/or forest owner companies that they would support the programme by encouraging crews to attend and that they support the programme framework that Wade proposes 5. Is wellness aspect optional or mandatory? 6. Re-scope as a pilot, but consider long-term viability of programme, e.g. will contractors continue to pay for membership of crews after the pilot is completed, and/or likelihood of it attracting funding support from other external funding sources?
<p>4.</p>	<p>1BT-01841 - Makokaho Manuka and Reversion – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of up to \$583,347 to deliver the planting 208.39ha of mānuka for honey production and 57.46ha as a native reversion. .</p> <p>□ The Panel discussed the application and focused on whether QEII had been consulted, if commercial grade or locally sourced mānuka will be planted, is the crop permanent or will it be felled/crushed once it stops producing and the availability of infrastructure required for the honey business.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion and follow-up by officials on the points raised the Panel supported the 1BT-01841 application.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Catchment Group Funding – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Verbal update on the progress of the 11 catchment applications. 6 are being progressed as part of the \$10m available funding. Due diligence has been undertaken, details are starting to be ironed out and they will be contracted by 30 June 2020. Of the 5 that did not get into this round of funding - 3 are being contracted through PDU and 2 will be coming back to panel next month as partnership applications.</p> <p>□ The Panel discussed the applications and focused on meeting regulatory requirements and the use of a geospatial data tool to provide consistent reporting to ministers.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the applications.</p>

6.	<p>TUR-1BT-2018-008 Punakaiki - Funding Agreement Variation – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Verbal update on a variation to the funding agreement with Conservation Volunteers New Zealand Inc. (1874760) for the Punakaiki Land Restoration project (TUR_1BT_2018_008).</p> <p>A variation is proposed to address the impact that COVID-19 has had on the project, and the need to shift project delivery away from a reliance on volunteer (tourist) labour to paid labour. This shift in delivery approach has an unbudgeted cost, therefore approval is being sought to increase the Agreement budget by a maximum amount of \$413,362.50.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">□ The Panel discussed the applications and focused on the need for the variation and the availability of workers.</p> <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the variation.</p>
-----------	---

General Business

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>The Chair suggested that the next panel meeting is held in Wellington. Elliot, Alan and Sam agreed they can attend, subject to Covid restrictions, Bryan requested to Zoom/Skype in. The Rotorua office will likely Skype in due to strict limitations on travel currently.</p>

Details of next meeting

Date	30/07/2020	Time	9:30am – 12:30pm
Venue	Wellington / Skype		

Minutes approved:

Peter Clark, Chair

30/06/2020

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



One Billion Trees Fund Advisory Panel

Meeting Minutes

Date	Thursday 30 July 2020.
Time	9:30am – 12:30am
Chair	Peter Clark
Members	Eliot Linforth-Hall (Investment Director, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment), Alan McDonald (Principal Advisor, Department of Conservation), Bryan Smith (Chief Advisor – Water Strategy, Ministry for the Environment), Sam Johnson (Principal Advisor, Te Puni Kōkiri), Peter Ettema (Principal Advisor, Agriculture and Investment Services)
Apologies	s 9(2)(a) (Acting Manager, 1BT Partnerships)
Attendees	Henry Weston (Director, Forestry Grants and Partnerships), s 9(2)(a)

Key points, decisions and actions

Item	Discussion
1.	Welcome, introductions & minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none">The meeting minutes for the 30 June 2020 meeting were accepted as true and correct.
2.	Conflict of Interest, Actions and Report Back <ul style="list-style-type: none">The actions from the last meeting were reviewed. All actions have been closed.The Chair advised of his conflict of interest in relation to 1BT-02248, this has been noted in the panel register with ID number 1BT-COI-018. Eliot will take over as Chair for this discussion.
3.	Forest Grants Pipeline Update: s 9(2)(a) <ul style="list-style-type: none">27,000ha planting, 13,000 exotic, 18 approved Maori freehold land 1700ha \$4.4 mill., 102 grants in pipeline, 7 Maori Freehold 811ha \$886k, Hukarere and Catchments approved waiting on recipient signatures, declined 14 applications - prior to refocus only 2 had ever been declined.
4.	1BT Partnerships Pipeline Update: H. Weston <ul style="list-style-type: none">Partnership funding reduced in June, contracted amount under the approved amount, should move up again in August, no significant approvals until new government in place, \$2m will be in front of ministers in next couple days.

Applications presented to panel

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>1BT-02272 SNBI Million Metres Streams – s 9(2)(a) / Henry Weston</p> <p>Sustainable Business Network Inc. - Jobs for nature - \$800k for J4N project through MfE, support to maintain overhead structure, use the money to support existing staff to continue with work and re-establish ongoing sustainability. Request is to backfill the \$80,000 that was withdrawn by Auckland Council to reprioritise to other Covid-related costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and no matters were raised. <p>Recommendation: Based on the discussion, the Panel supported the 1BT-02272 application.</p>
2.	<p>1BT-SAG – Summary to 30 July 2020 – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>s 9(2)(a) joined our panel meeting to introduce the Strategic Science Advisory Group and to discuss how it fits into the science research funded in part by TUR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the role of the SSAG and focused on where a science plan fits and how to implement what we know. • The Chair advised that the knowledge hub is currently being built and this would be a great repository to become the go-to for knowledge on trees.
3.	<p>1BT-01603 Poplar and Willow Research, NZ Poplar & Willow Trust – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of \$245,000 over three years to deliver poplar and willow training workshops for a range of end users, field trials of novel willow cultivars and investigation of new approaches to increase the establishment rate of conservation trees in pastoral landscapes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on need for the willow trials to be removed as per SSAG recommendations, the co-funding for the project, how it could be integrated into farm plans and the scope for the projects to engage with MPI and MfE. <p>Recommendation: Based on the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01603 application subject to co-funding being reviewed, financials being adjusted, and willow trials being removed.</p>
4.	<p>1BT-01765 Horizons Farming Ltd Longrange Farm Application – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of \$720,445 to retire two parts of a 734ha property to 152ha of mixed indigenous planting on a large area of steep, highly erodible land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focussed on the stocking rate and the likelihood of it assisting with erosion control, the management of the manuka for honey being clear and re-plant vs. the erosion control objective and transition to indigenous, the need to be careful with milestones and payment on surviving trees and the breakdown of manuka allocation vs tall trees. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01765 application.</p>
5.	<p>1BT-00029 Mt Dewar – Treespace No.1 Partnership – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>A 1BT investment of \$564,480 to enable reforestation of 94ha beech on 1700ha property, highly visible, planting rate approved by FALU, tall tree planting, lower stems/ha still reach establishment criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on pest control, objective detail of FTE components, stocking rate and the provisions in place to control wildings. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-00029 application subject to making wilding control explicit in the contract.</p>

<p>6.</p>	<p>1BT-02093 Waikene Station Ltd – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>This proposal is for the planting of 437.88ha of native species on a large, multi-use property west of Kaikoura. The management of the property and any future ETS applications will be handled by Ollie Belton, while seedlings, planting and management of the project will be overseen by Andrew Wearmouth of Kauri Park Nursery. Kauri Park has set up a satellite nursery on the South Island and has begun propagation of tall tree species for this project. The native forest will be used for manuka honey production as well as native restoration of the area and potential ETS registration in the future. The landowner has an agreement with Kauri Park nursery that six locals from Ngati Kurī will be hired and trained to work full-time, year-round on this project, which includes propagation, planting, and land management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the stocking rate with regards to manuka vs tall trees, whether pest control has been incorporated into the budget, the need to ensure that they are getting the correct rate as they are clearing manuka to replace it with more manuka, the species of beech that will be planted and because of the landlocked nature of the land the need to ensure legal and practical access to the land. • The chair advised that the survival of tall trees is key to ensure we are not subsidising a manuka plantation at the higher mixed indigenous funding rates. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-02093 application.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>1BT-01961 Tane Mahuta (NZ) Ltd – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of \$227,375 over 12 weeks to enable 20 trainees to obtain level 2 and 3 NZQA qualifications in general forestry requirements and tree planting/releasing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the outcomes of the previous training course, the degree of MSD involvement with the programme, the transparency of the budget, the cost of the trainer, whether they would be eligible for TEC funding through Competenz, and disclosure of income earned through commercial contracting services. • Panel members expressed concern over the cost per trainee and suggested budget line items be supported by unit cost detail. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01961 application subject to due diligence on whoever they are partnering with for training, and a detailed budget being part of the contracting phase.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>1BT-02040 Mohaka Kingz Contracting Ltd – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of \$72,548 over 8 weeks to enable 12 trainees to obtain level 2 NZQA qualifications in general forestry requirements and tree planting/releasing and to be supported towards obtaining driver licences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on whether there will be employment for the trainees after the course and whether the trainees will want to undertake the employment offered to them. <p>Recommendation: Based on the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-02040 application.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>1BT-02024 Rangataiki Taniwha Trail – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for an investment of \$595,200 over two years to deliver the planting of 60,000 native plants over 30ha as part of developing the 5km long Kopuatoto Forest Trail, employment of 1 FTE supervisor and 0.3 a project administrator over two years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on the total funding for this project including DOC and MSD, asking if NZ Trails Trust or any other funding organisations had been approached. The costs seem quite high, the need for a more detailed budget, whether the trail will be made publicly accessible. <p>Recommendation: Based on the discussion the Panel support the 1BT-02040 application.</p>

10.	<p>1BT-01449 Tane's Tree Trust Totara Manual – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Development guide to help landowners make good decisions around land use changes, managed at same time as Remeasurement of Farm Totara contract \$62k to assist with coordination and collaboration of existing research into practical guide and video.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application and focused on whether people would be inspired by a 3 minute video, how it differs from the willow and poplar paper, application to both new planting and silvicultural treatments of existing stands, whether the guide would be incorporated into the new knowledge hub, the interest from Maori farmers and the value of how to use the timber down the track. <p>Recommendation: Based on the discussion the Panel supported the 1BT-01449 application.</p>
11.	<p>1BT-02248 Funding Proposal – Connecting Maori Land with Investment Funding and Operational Capability – s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>Proposal for a 1BT investment of \$1,696,000 over 3 years aims to deliver 20,000 hectares of underutilised Maori land into forestry joint ventures (commercial exotic, carbon or indigenous) through the establishment of a new business entity that will bring together land assets, capital investment and industry expertise intended to create successful commercialisation of Māori owned land blocks across Aotearoa.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel discussed the application at length. There was general agreement around the nature of the opportunity and the issue that needs to be addressed. A question about the model proposed and how a funding agreement could be structured to protect Crown risk. Also, a question around how this connects with other players in the field and the need to check with TPK about s 9(2)(a) work. There is a need to be very clear that the right outcomes are identified with a question about whether number of hectares will drive the right results and is the only measure of success. Team to go away and do some more work on how a funding agreement could be structured. <p>Recommendation: On the basis of the discussion the Panel deferred a decision on support the 1BT-02248 application, noting that time is of the essence and willingness to consider modifications to the proposal by e-mail.</p>

General Business

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>The Chair suggested that the next panel meeting is held in Wellington subject to current Covid situation being maintained. s 9(2) to send out comms closer to the date to confirm the meeting location.</p>

Details of next meeting

Date	27/08/2020	Time	9:30am – 12:30pm
Venue	Wellington / Skype TBC		

Minutes approved by Peter Clark, Chair on 06/07/2020