

Deep dive on concessions

Conservation Amendment Bill

20 March 2025



**Te Kāwanatanga
o Aotearoa**
New Zealand Government



Modernising conservation land management

Discussion document | He pepa kōrero

November 2024 | Noema 2024



**Te Kāwanatanga
o Aotearoa**
New Zealand Government

Agenda

Initial thinking on:

- Role of Treaty partners in concessions process

To note:

- We'll discuss the substantive outcome of concession decisions, for example criteria for deciding how to allocate concessions following a contestable process, on another day.
- Class authorisation of activities through the NCPS and area plans will have their own processes including Treaty partner engagement, separate to the regular concessions process. Class authorisations should remove straightforward concessions from the system.
- The rest of this session is about remaining concession applications.

Objectives of law change

The discussion document proposed a range of changes to:

- Speed up concessions processes, and
- Provide clarity about what is required to give effect to Treaty principles (section 4) in terms of participation and informed decision-making.

Proposals in discussion document

When engagement is needed

Engagement not required where:

- Treaty partners have said engagement not required.
- Application would make only minor changes to existing or previous concessions.

Timeframes for engagement

- Treaty partners would have 20 working days to provide their views, or longer if specified by Minister.
- Decision-making can proceed based on existing information if no response received.

Interim analysis of submissions

Treaty partners – range of views including:

- Engagement now can be “overwhelming”.
- Support for engaging about types of applications. Some more willing to triage engagement than others.
- Should be resourced for their role in concessions.
- Should also have a greater role in making decisions.
- 20 working days not long enough to provide views.

Stakeholders including concessionaires

- Support shorter, more certain processes, including having timeframes for Treaty partner engagement.
- Engagement with Treaty partners shouldn't be required for lower risk concessions.

Proposed approach

Progress with proposals in relation to:

- Engagement not required where application makes only minor changes to existing/previous concessions.
- 20 working days for Treaty partners to provide views, or any longer, reasonable timeframe specified by Minister.

Supporting Treaty partner participation

- Note: lower volumes due to class (bulk) authorisations.
- s9(2)(f)(iv)

Supporting regulatory system efficiency

- Alternative option: align Treaty partner engagement requirements with public notification requirements (i.e. only consult on notified applications).

s9(2)(f)(iv)

Coming up

<i>Date</i>	<i>Topics for discussion</i>
Next week	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Management planning processes, including role of Treaty partners• Access charging: where and who to charge
31 March week	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Competitive allocation• Access charging: regime design
7 April week	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Land exchanges and disposals, including role of Treaty partners
14 April week	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmation of all decisions needed for land management Cabinet paper
28 April week	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Options for first NCPS, including role of Treaty partner in process