

# National Advisory Group for Integrative Planning (NAGIP)

## Notes from Meeting, 17 February 2011

**Present:** Campbell Jensen (Ministry for the Environment), Gerald Rys (Ministry Agriculture and Forestry), Mike Reid (Local Government NZ), Stephen Oakley (Statistics NZ), Fiona Ryan (Ministry of Economic Development), Urlwyn Trebilco (Environment Waikato), Beat Huser (Environment Waikato), Daniel Rutledge (Landcare Research), Vicky Forgie (Ecological Economics Research NZ), Judy Lawrence (Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University), Peter Salter (Ministry of Social Development), Eduardo Villouta (Department of Conservation), Richard Murcott (Land Information NZ - *left 10.55*), Julia Forsyth (Wellington City Council), Jacques Poot (University of Waikato), Karlheinz Knickel (Ministry for the Environment), Karl Majorhazi (Ministry for the Environment), Robert Brodnax (NZ Transport Authority), Eva McLaren (Auckland Council), Melanie Thornton (Greater Wellington RC), Jane Davis (Greater Wellington RC)

**Apologies:** Grant Barnes (AC), David Clelland (AC), Michael Tucker (AC) Marjan van den Belt (EERNZ), Martin Butler (Bay of Plenty RC), Helen Codlin (Hawkes Bay RC), Adam Cooper (LINZ), Philip Eyles (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment), Michael Krausse (Landcare Research), David Hermans (National Infrastructure Unit, Treasury)

**Chair:** Beat Huser

## Purpose of Meeting

Beat Huser introduced the meeting by saying that its purpose is to determine how best to support integrative spatial planning in New Zealand. The focus of the National Advisory Group for Integrative Planning (NAGIP) is not to debate policy or legislative issues around spatial planning but to support integrated/spatial planning by promoting the development of appropriate systems and tools such as models and decision support systems (DSS) to do integrative planning. While it is not possible to predict the future the technology now exists to use scenario planning, forecasting, simulation etc. to think about what the future could be like, to explore best pathways to get there and to be well prepared for changes along the way.

Specifically, the objective of the meeting was to answer two key questions:

1. Do we want to set up a National Advisory Group to support and guide the development of systems for integrative planning in New Zealand?
2. If yes, what would this group like to achieve going forward?

Introductions allowed those in attendance to outline their interest in models/DSS and other systems supporting integrative planning, and what their organisation was doing re integrative/spatial planning.

**Mike Reid** drew attention to a special session on spatial planning as part of the upcoming *Local Government New Zealand Conference 2011*, 10-13 July, Wellington Convention Centre, <http://www.conference.co.nz/lgnz11>.

## Why do we Need a National Advisory Group?

Background: The 'Creating Futures' FRST project had an advisory group and the recently initiated 'Sustainable Pathways 2' FRST project also needs an advisory group. Given the general interest and need for integrated/spatial planning and tools to support this it would seem logical to move from a project-specific process to a more inclusive national level. This broader focus is aligned with new guidelines for the setting up of Advisory Groups for research programmes by the Ministry for Science and Innovation (MSI).

Beat Huser outlined some observations about why setting up a National Advisory Group for Integrative Planning (NAGIP) may be beneficial:

1. New technologies allow the development of innovative and effective tools to better link science to policy (e.g. modelling, visualisation, DSS). Resources going into this area need to be coordinated, integrated and communicated to interested parties.
2. Increasingly current and emerging issues have a long-term focus, i.e. climate change.
3. Location-focussed and place-based approaches receive increasing attention – spatial planning.
4. Integration is a key element for spatial planning. Integration has multiple aspects:
  - a. Spatial – 'from mountain to sea', land/water, integrated catchment management
  - b. Vertical integration (integrating central/local government)
  - c. Horizontal (working together between and within organisations)
  - d. Legislation (Resource Management Act, Land Transport Management Act, Local Government Act, etc.
  - e. Linking the four well-beings (economic, social, cultural, and environmental).

**This multi-faceted integration and coordination is where NAGIP could make a difference.**

The definition of Spatial Planning used in the MfE discussion document on "Building Competitive Cities" (MfE, 2010<sup>1</sup>):

*A spatial plan is a high-level strategy for developing a region that relates to its geography, and seeks to achieve desired broad outcomes. Developed and implemented via collaboration between multiple parties, it provides a mechanism for agreeing joint priorities, actions and investment.*

Points from the discussion that followed about how NAGIP could support spatial planning:

1. Spatial planning is not being done by all organisations. No general acceptance of the need for this, but integrative planning is widely done, and a preferred overarching term (with spatial planning a sub-type of integrative planning).
2. We do planning well, but don't integrate enough.
3. How the tools/systems will change the way planning is currently done needs to be made clear. What is the added value?
4. Integrated planning needs to go beyond local government. Needs to include central government – that's where the added value comes in.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/building-competitive-cities-discussion-document/index.html>

5. Added values include visualisation; actually doing integrative planning as opposed to talking about it adds value.
6. Systems and tools such as models/DSS allow bringing together disparate information to a location based issue. Systems to enable integration is crucial – currently a lot of information is locked away in silos.
7. Auckland’s problem is not lack of plans but lack of implementation. Central government is not part of planning for Auckland but has an important stake in outcomes. Need a more joined up approach where all parties engage and understand their role. Spatial planning for Auckland is not regarded as a blueprint but a way of achieving multiple outcomes – a means to end. Philosophy is to use investment to achieve planning outcomes rather than regulation. The market will then follow the investment.
8. This will not be achievable for non-market services which are also important, so regulation (and other policy mechanisms) will be required for these functions.

### **Some Relevant Projects – An Overview**

1. **WISE - Waikato Integrated Scenario Explorer** (Beat Huser). A brief YouTube video was played to introduce the integrated spatial regional WISE model ([www.youtube.com/watch?v=RgEABCz1Rrl](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RgEABCz1Rrl)). WISE is currently being tested using real-life examples and case studies to support council planning and decision-making. It is managed by Environment Waikato in-house, with long-term funding secured through its Long Term Plan 2009-2019. WISE needs ongoing maintenance and data updates, as well as access to experts for scenario development and interpretation of results. EW has created a ‘community of experts’ for this purpose through Service Agreements, which also helps to build capability.
2. **Web-based directory of models/DSS** (Beat Huser). Environlink tools project starting in July 2011 (research provider Massey University/EERNZ). Provides an accessible web-based directory of existing models/DSS with practical examples of what they can do.
3. **Sustainable Pathways 2** (Vicky Forgie). The goal of the 6-year (2009-2015) research project is to provide integrated decision support using: 1. Mediated Modelling; 2. Spatial Dynamic Modelling. It aims to develop integrated spatial models for Auckland and Wellington, similar to WISE. In the ensuing discussion, it was noted that data requirements are a major issue. It is difficult to get agreement on standardised datasets that are acceptable to multiple parties, and across the country, e.g. population predictions or a standard for sea level rise.
4. **Ministry for the Environment** (Campbell Jensen): The ~300 submissions made to ‘Building competitive cities’ MfE discussion document are currently being considered. Also the influence of spatial planning on other plans such as LTP, RMA plans, LTMP, setting achievable targets and keeping track through effective monitoring. Government is looking at the policy options around spatial planning for the rest of New Zealand including coastal marine areas. This analysis and evaluation is leading up to a Cabinet decision.

5. **NZ Transport Authority, NZTA** (Robert Brodnax). Government as an investor in transport infrastructure is actively involved in a number of spatial planning exercises. Needs to demonstrate value of investment. Keen to be able to inform land use planning by showing how road network can accommodate growth going forward. Current work include: a) assessing SH1 network classification; b) modelling, e.g. Waikato Regional Transport Model (CCO governance) that also links to Auckland and Bay of Plenty; c) integrating and centralising geospatial information across NZTA; d) accessibility mapping with local councils (e.g. biking/walking); e) research bid to support the integration of land use and freight.
6. **Waikato Spatial Plan** (Urlwyn Trebilco). Environment Waikato in its Annual Plan 2011/12 proposes to initiate work towards a regional spatial plan. This is likely to consider neighbouring regions, e.g. Auckland, Bay of Plenty, Northland ('Top of the North'). These four regions currently also work on agreements to share information and collaborate on strategic planning.

Points from the discussion that followed:

- Focus should not just be on spatial planning for growth. Also need to consider planning for decline.
- The use of models/DSS and associated technology is a paradigm shift from today's planning practise.
- Spatial/integrative planning is a new discipline. Need to build capability and capacity.
- Need nationally consistent databases to use models/DSS tools and integrate planning needs.

## **Purpose and Role of National Advisory Group for Integrative Planning (NAGIP)**

The Draft Terms of Reference (ToR) was discussed (circulated prior to meeting).

What should be the scope of NAGIP? Tools for policy or at a more technical level?

Different views were expressed on who should be on the NAGIP from *'if want to implement we need to include the next governance level'* to *'the users should be on the NAGIP as they are the ones needing to be convinced'*.

What are 'tools'? Does the NAGIP cover complex modelling tools/DSS only or also standards and protocols for data sharing, interoperability? *'Role for Advisory Group to formalise link to higher management level to ensure integration, collaboration and consistency. For example, a lot of data locked up in regional councils, these need to accessible for national planning'*.

It was suggested that 'systems' (Decision Support System) is a better term than 'tools'. *'System includes both the governance side as well as the technical needs'. 'The Advisory Group should support collaborative processes'*.

Who owns the tools (stewards), how accessible are they, what are the costs? *'The web-based directory (Enviolink project, see page 3) will address some of these questions'.*

What is the exact role of the NAGIP? *'Purpose and role comes first, how this is carried out is a separate issue'.*

Spatial planning is a fast changing field at the moment. *'There are benefits in coming together to share information. More discussion time would be useful'.*

Promotion of integrated planning approaches. *'Role of group can be advocating and supporting integrated planning beyond the boundaries we usually operate at. This group covers the range of organisations and has the experience and expertise to collaborate'.*

**Summary** of points:

1. Widely accepted need for integrative planning
2. NAGIP is about systems supporting integrative planning processes
3. NAGIP should have a role in providing advice and direction for processes and technical issues that support integrative planning (data/information needs, standards and protocols, interoperability etc.)
4. Links should be made to both higher level decision-makers and more technical work and research
5. NAGIP can provide ideas and guidance about where integrative planning could go
6. Sharing information, knowledge, current and planned activities is useful.

The specific contributions members of NAGIP can make:

1. Be a point of contact for your organisation
2. Seek relevant input from within your organisation and networks for NAGIP
3. Communication with your organisation and networks
4. Provide feedback on project-specific outputs (e.g. from SP2)<sup>2</sup>

The issue of 'conflict of interest' was discussed in the context of research providers (CRIs, universities) potentially being party to identifying and recommending research needs. A clause will be added to the Terms of Reference to address this and if necessary organisations may have to withdraw from a specific discussion.

Similarly, it was noted that a conflict of interest arises in the case of NAGIP being involved in making submissions to Government proposals etc. It was decided to delete the respective sentence in the ToR.

If anyone has changes they would like to the ToR these should be forwarded to Beat Huser (<mailto:beat.huser@ew.govt.nz>).

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, the SP2 programme needs advice on Auckland and Wellington related issues as part of its research programme. It is acknowledged, however, that not all NAGIP members will be interested in providing advice and feedback. The SP2 programme leader will be approaching members for input.

## Where to From Here

Notes and presentations from this meeting are on the website at [www.sp2.org.nz/about-the-project/advisory-group/](http://www.sp2.org.nz/about-the-project/advisory-group/).

Presentations include:

1. Background slides
2. Creating Futures/WISE
3. Sustainable Pathways 2 (SP2)

The discussion document for the Auckland Spatial Plan will be out in April. This is likely to identify what the big issues for integrative planning are, what the information needs are and any gaps and how the technology being developed comes in.

It is planned to focus on the Auckland Spatial Plan for the next meeting. Other topics may include: Up-date on current projects (SP2, Envirolink directory, WISE case studies, Environmental Domains Plan, etc); key datasets and information sources; others?<sup>3</sup>

<b><u>Next meeting date:</u>    19 August, 2011, Auckland Council, Auckland</b>
---

---

<sup>3</sup> Please let me know if there are any topics you would like to include for our next meeting, email me [beat.huser@ew.govt.nz](mailto:beat.huser@ew.govt.nz) or give me a call 021 368 954.