

Sent: Tuesday, 13 September 2011 12:16 p.m.
To: Environmental Reporting
Subject: Measuring up feedback

Dear sir/Madam,

I would be interested in attending (if possible at time) the symposium to be held in the new year on Environmental Reporting and the Discussion Document recently released.

I would need to consider the report after the symposium really but initial thoughts were as follows:

- 1) p. 1: Future New Zealand success. In relation to the Foreword, the second sentence underscores the dependence we currently have on 'high quality agricultural exports and our lucrative tourist industry...'. Indeed, we must use these current advantages, and to do that we need to attend to an efficient and effective means of monitoring our environment. However, I believe we should be using the current advantages and resource base of our farming and natural environments to provide 1) a means to reach for a future with a higher proportion of more per capita valuable exports (IP and/or smarter manufacturing rather than commodity goods), and 2) the cultural and natural setting where people are going to want to stay or to come to provide the brains, drive and dollars to develop these new, non-commodity or tourism based industries. Refer Paul Callaghan regarding weaning ourselves off these low productivity industries. Nevertheless, I agree with the thrust of this document.
- 2) p.4 and later: I support in principle at least the channel of the PCE, who is indeed perceived as independent. However, I would expect a large budget would be needed even if other agencies were largely responsible for collecting the raw data. Such a cost might be less for an organisation used to processing environmental data, e.g. a CRI, but the loss would be the lack of perceived (or actual) freedom and loss of objectivity.
- 3) I agree with the issues (Questions 1-3), but believe the Q3 choice is not sensible: obligation is needed, and so is a consistent state of monitoring.
- 4) in relation to consistency, while there might need to be a set of factors and associated means of studying them (how, when, by whom etc.) applied across the country, unique regional factors, or factors that apply in some and not other regions might also be needed. For instance, on the east of the country (drier, sunnier etc.) there might be great need to study some things that are not relevant in the west. Or maybe this is a difference in intensity of monitoring rather than missing plots in some regions.
- 5) p. 22: biodiversity and the environment. Assuming this is native biodiversity, perhaps we also have a responsibility to monitor exotic biodiversity that might be covered by IUCN concerns, or covered by Convention on Biological Diversity because threatened in the wild in home country.

Thank you for producing what appears to be a very sensible document.

Regards,

Christchurch Botanic Gardens

Christchurch Botanic Gardens
Rolleston Avenue
PO Box 73036
Christchurch 8011
New Zealand

Please consider the environment before printing this email

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete.

Christchurch City Council

<http://www.ccc.govt.nz>
