



Planning Under  
Co-operative Mandates

**PUCM Practice Development Programme (PDP)  
February 2005**

**PUCM PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (PDP)**  
**February 2005**

**1. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to identify a Practice Development Programme (PDP) for the presentation of relevant innovative practices and tools arising out of the first two Phases of PUCM (Planning Under Co-operative Mandates). During Phase 3 of the research (2004-2006) the PDP will be extended as new findings come to hand.

**2. OBJECTIVE 4**

Objective 4 sets out to prepare and implement a practice development programme that draws on outputs from PUCM phases one to four to ensure best methods and practices are available for planning and governance under the RMA and LGA. Telling agencies about the PUCM research methods and results (as done previously), does not maximise uptake. Instead, professionals will be trained in their use, in order to build capacity in key end-user and provider groups, such as central government, local government, hapu/iwi, and tertiary institutions (where planning, resource management, and governance is a focus), as well as for the public generally through community education.

**3. PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

The *PUCM Practice Development Programme* (Objective 4) aims to build capability among key end-users and providers for using the principles and methods so that the research benefits to New Zealand for better planning and governance under the RMA and LGA can be realized.

In PUCM 1 & 2 “capability” has been defined as the combination of capacity and commitment (*2<sup>nd</sup> PUCM Report to Government*). Capacity is the degree of resources, expertise, and time available to each council, hapū, and iwi, group or individual to fulfil various functions. Commitment is the willingness of participants to avoid adverse environmental effects, and to show responsibility towards the environment. Training builds both capacity and commitment.

PUCM 3’s Objective 4 also fits in well with a business training source ([www.imparta.com](http://www.imparta.com)) which relates capability building to the situation where “success often comes from being better at doing things, and superb at doing things that really matter.” Imparta uses capability building as a means for “accelerating the development and application of new skills deep into the organisation.”

While PUCM modes of information transfer in the past were effective in reaching a large network of providers and end-users, the focus was mainly on *informing them about* the research findings, new methods, and recommendations for better practice. They did not focus on training them in *how to use the principles and methods* for planning and governance. While past modes of information transfer will continue to be used (peer review group meetings, feedback workshops, PUCM webpage,

publications, etc.), Objective 4 proposes a new practice development programme around key outputs.

- Training of relevant personnel in the use of innovative practice and tools
- Promoting the extension of tertiary education curricula
- Provision of lessons from PUCM for developing long-term community planning
- Contributions to PUCM website

This is a major shift in strategy designed to reduce uptake risks by ensuring key outputs (principles, methods and tools for planning and governance) reach the main end-users, especially in local government and Maori/hapū/iwi. This strategy involves eliciting support from lead government agencies and professional associations and includes delivery through tertiary institutions and other forums, like e-learning.

#### **4. KEY AUDIENCES AND TOPICS BY OUTPUT**

##### ***Training relevant personnel to use innovative practice and tools***

PUCM 1 & 2 identified the need for training elected members and officers in local government, and their equivalents in central government ministries and departments where they have roles pertaining to the RMA. The equivalent need for training about the LGA is covered by Outcome 3 (Providing lessons from PUCM for developing long-term community planning). The participation of planning consultants and allied professions in plan-making and plan implementation means that they too have to be included in any training opportunities. Audience needs vary across topics and therefore care has to be given in matching topics to the particular audience. Some audiences may need to be treated separately from others, while for some topics the purpose of the training can be common to more than one audience. It is also important to recognise that local government councillors may lack knowledge and understanding about national mandates, council structures and functions, roles and responsibilities, and ethical behaviour that spans both the RMA and LGA. Attention can be paid to these aspects through a carefully designed training programme centred on PUCM findings. Examples of possible topics are as follows<sup>1</sup>:

*Understanding inter-governmental mandates, with particular reference to the RMA and the LGA.*

*Rationale for systematic evaluation of plans and the planning systems (by level of governance)*

*Eight criteria for Plan Quality and factors enabling the preparation of good plans*

*Key indicators of plan quality*

---

<sup>1</sup> These topics may be considered as separate ‘courses’ or combined in one ‘course’. The latter is illustrated by the 2002 course at Lincoln University on Plan Quality and Implementation. Topics may also be incorporated in training initiated by the Ministry for the Environment and Local Government New Zealand.

*Content Analysis as a method for evaluating plans (includes assessment of when it is a useful method, the process for developing the plan coding protocol, applying it, and analysing the results)*

*Choosing Methods for Managing SNAs in plans (using “Fracas at the Frontier” as a case stated and/or in a simulation)*

Other initiatives are possible with topics based on:

- case study materials e.g., Tauranga and managing risks from natural hazards in the coastal environment (demonstrates the value of research, also inter-governmental co-operation).
- whanau/hapu/iwi materials ( these might cover consultation, partnerships in governance and plan content analysis; Far North District Council simulation could be used)

### ***Promoting the extension of tertiary education curricula***

Another audience for PUCM findings has been found in the tertiary education sector. The direction suggested here is for initiatives that will draw the attention of academics teaching in fields which relate to planning, resource management, and local government policy and plan-making generally. The PUCM research has, and will continue to, develop knowledge which should be integrated into a range of tertiary curricula.

A *Tertiary Corresponding Members* (TCM) group has formed through responses to an initial enquiry to gauge interest in PUCM Objective 4 (Practice Development Programme) and with respect to tertiary institutions. The plan was to maintain an email dialogue between staff in the ongoing PUCM Research Programme and tertiary institutions. An aim was to consider prospects for incorporating PUCM’s methods and findings, including lessons about the RMA and LGA, into tertiary courses. By providing course materials it is hoped to provide a conduit of information so that University graduates from a range of disciplines may have insights into policy, plan-making, and plan-evaluation that can be carried into any subsequent professional or political careers.

Within the TCM group is another group who have indicated an interest in more “hands-on” involvement through the *Tertiary Peer Review Working Group* (PRWG). This group meets with the PUCM Team through workshops.

A regular newsletter has also been developed to maintain contact between the Objective 4 Tertiary Corresponding Members (TCM) and the PUCM Team.

The indicative topics listed above are also relevant to this part of the PDP.

### ***Providing lessons from PUCM for developing long-term community planning***

The field of long-term community planning is intended to extend the scope of PUCM from planning and resource management to the broader range of activities signalled

by the new Local Government Act of 2002. This outcome will especially draw on the research contained in PUCM Objective 2 (LG Act and Long-term Council Community Plans) as well as Objective 3 (Environmental Outcomes for Māori). Examples of topics to be included in this outcome are signalled by the following publications completed to date:

Ericksen, N.J., Chapman, S. and Crawford, J., n.d.: *A Guide to Plan-Making in New Zealand: The Next Generation*, PUCM, IGCI, University of Waikato, N.Z. (released in 2004)

Ericksen, N.J., Berke, P.R., Crawford, J.L., and Dixon, J.E., 2003: *Planning for Sustainability: New Zealand Under the RMA*, IGCI, The University of Waikato, N.Z.

Borrie, N., Memon, P.A., et al, 2004: [draft only available for Lessons from RMA for LGA]

Jefferies, R., Warren, T. et al, 2002: Iwi interests and the RMA: An evaluation of the quality of first generation council plans, *Māori Working Paper No. 1*, PUCM, Kōkōmuka Consultancy Ltd and IGCI, University of Waikato, N.Z.

### ***Contributing to PUCM (and Quality Plan) website***

Providing support to the PUCM website ([www.waikato.ac.nz/igci/pucm](http://www.waikato.ac.nz/igci/pucm)) is another outcome for Objective 4. This includes, through a link, support for the Ministry for the Environment's Quality Plan website ([www.qualityplanning.org.nz](http://www.qualityplanning.org.nz)). The activities forthcoming from the previous outcomes will be cross-referenced to the websites for general information. Consideration will also be given to developing specific materials for use in web-based learning.

## **5. RELEVANT INNOVATIVE PRACTICE AND TOOLS**

The internal and published reports for PUCM Phases 1 and 2 suggest a number of issues, practices and tools that could be organised into a Practice Development Programme. At this stage they are indicative only and could include the following:

### ***5.1 Evaluation of Plans – General***

Rationale for systematic evaluation of plans and the planning systems (by level of governance).

Supporting references:

Dixon et al, 1997: Planning under a co-operative mandate: new plans for New Zealand, *J. Environmental Planning and Management*, 40(5), 603-614.

May, P., Burby et al, 1996: *Environmental Management and Governance: Intergovernmental Approaches to Hazards and Sustainability* (London, Routledge).

## 5.2 *Plan coding*

Plan coding: to be part of a package on District Plan review/evaluation as part of the process of district plan reviews. The package would be directed at reviewing district plans, by building on “Ways to improve Plan making” (Ericksen, et al, 2003, p.7).

One part of the package should teach “content analysis” as a method using the PUCM PQ & IQ protocols as examples alongside other work (e.g., Berke on natural hazards and for Lincoln (see draft chapter sent from ULUP)). In their exercises, participants would be challenged to think of other ways to use content analysis in their work, and to modify/improve on the PUCM protocols for their particular region/district.

The instruction on plan coding could also be approached in the context of sections of the district plan for a TLA just as Phase 1 looked across several district plans and compared results. This will enable councils to establish where the PQ is uneven.<sup>2</sup> Some criteria were designed to test specific topics in plans and we applied these to Maori and natural hazards across the board. However, not all plans are organised logically so that everything on, say, SNAs is found in one chapter and therefore the protocol has to be applied to everything in the plan that relates to the selected topic e.g., the Waikato Plan had Maori stuff in several different parts whereas the Hawkes Bay RPS had a single chapter on this. Would need several coders and good inter-coder reliability scores to be rigorous but the results would be very enlightening. See *PUCM 1 Guideline* (Jan. 2003, pp. 26-29).

## 5.3 *Plan quality*

Factors enabling the preparation of good plans. This would be derived from work on contextual factors and organisational barriers to improving plan quality, and needs to be presented as constructive guidance and direction. The session could include exercises in leadership, organisational design, management skills linked to the steps in the plan making process. It could include some cases (e.g. contracting out v. in-house)<sup>3</sup> (Jan Crawford, pers.com.).

### Supporting references

Dixon et al, 1997: Planning under a co-operative mandate: new plans for New Zealand, *J. Environmental Planning and Management*, 40(5), p.611 (also Table 2).

Plan quality – eight criteria: While the eight criteria used to assess PQ need to be included in any instruction on the subject, not all of them justify the same amount of attention as others. They would have to follow on from a general session on *Content Analysis*, or include some scene setting material first.

---

<sup>2</sup> Jan Crawford has noted (pers. com.) that, “Some criteria were designed to test specific topics in plans and we applied these to Maori and natural hazards across the board. However, not all plans are organised logically so that everything on, say, SNAs is found in one chapter and therefore the protocol has to be applied to everything in the plan that relates to the selected topic (e.g. the Waikato Plan had Maori references in several different parts whereas the Hawkes Bay RPS had a single chapter on this). This would need several coders and good inter-coder reliability scores to be rigorous but the results would be very enlightening.

<sup>3</sup> Check QP website for a note on contracting out.

Of the eight principles, *Internal Consistency* is worth a separate module because it is highly relevant to consent planners – the most frequent users of the plan. One angle to this is the task of assessing applications in terms of RMA sections 104 & 105, where consent planners find it frustrating when poor plan writing makes it hard to tell which objectives and policies are relevant and when there are discontinuities and/or inconsistencies between and among them. There could be class exercises that can work from the plan down, or from the application back up, by choosing a few judgements that have to be made (e.g., rural subdivision/cumulative effects). (Jan Crawford, pers.com.). See also *PUCM 1 Guideline* (Jan. 2003, pp.11-20).

Furthermore, building the fact base, issue definition, choosing anticipated environmental results (or AERS), and designing the monitoring framework, go well together. Depending on the context, they make more sense as a group than individually, although *Issue Definition* could be a separate topic using examples and having participants extract all of the issue statements from a plan and then compare/critique.

While key indicators of plan quality could be taught to persons wanting to evaluate their council's capacity there may be a better way to achieve an improvement of the next generation of plans. This is because *capacity to plan* is a function of wealth, number of staff, expertise, funds allocated, and time (i.e., resources available). A critical point is to teach that ensuring sufficient capacity is about *making a plan to make the plan* and then *managing the process*. Such a course should draw on those planners who have been through this as part of a module aimed at councillors and senior managers in medium to low capacity councils. The focus would be matching expectations of PQ to willingness to pay. In addition it would be helpful to the next generation of plans if we could encourage councils to concentrate on certain aspects of plan making would be most effective in improving PQ (i.e., research, monitoring etc.). See also *PUCM 1 Guideline* (Jan. 2003, pp.22-25).

#### **5.4 Governance problems under the RMA**

First, there is the need for planners to understand the intergovernmental context within which plans are made and then what the RMA means when it is applied in a particular area.

There are two PQ criteria that attempt to grapple with interpreting sustainable management in plans. They were hard to apply, partly because sustainable management was a concept in its infancy. It might be helpful to planners writing the next round of plans if there was a module on “what is sustainable management etc” in general, and “how do we figure out what it means for our region/district?” Instead of referring to case law, which is not that helpful, we'd look at the international literature and practice, national framework, national indicators project and any other high level material, then take first generation plans apart in exercises. For second generation plans, it's a challenge to localise the intricacies of international obligations like climate change, deal with the difficulties of GMO releases, and have the courage to prioritise issues. We'd teach them how to think about s5 in ways that help to conceptualise the plan and contain it as well. Again, we can draw on experienced planners for lively contributions.

Looking specifically at the PUCM content we need to include the following as part of a package:

- Mandates – understanding what these are; see *Report to Government*, F.2.1, p.ix; *PUCM 1 Guideline* (Jan. 2003, p.3); see also Berke, Dixon and Ericksen, 1997: Coercive and cooperative intergovernmental mandates: a comparative analysis of Florida and New Zealand environmental plans, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 24, 451-468.
- Capability – commitment and capacity
- Maori partnership

### **5.5 Capability building**

When considered as a topic there is a benefit from building on to the initial analysis and conclusions reached in PUCM 1 and 2. This could include reviewing previous training intended to build capability/capacity. In other words, there have been other efforts (e.g. MfE for newly elected councillors), and our work could look at what have they covered, and how have these performed (assuming there were evaluations done).

Specific aspects covered by PUCM that need to be included are:

Organisational capability: see *Report to Government*, F.1.2, p.viii. There is reference here to gaps throughout the local government planning process, and each or some of the bullet-points could be considered together as a module. For this topic it is worth noting that the audience for this topic will be primarily councillors and senior managers (i.e. decision-makers).

Institutional arrangements: see *Report to Government*, F.1.3, pp.viii-ix. There is a reference here to structures influencing planning processes and the bullet-points could be considered as a module. This topic could be combined with the above to target those in authority.

Implementation: *Report to Government*, F.2.2, p.x. The foci for this topic could be *understanding the importance of planning for implementation* and *identifying critical resource needs and risks*. See also 2<sup>nd</sup> *PUCM Report to Government* (April 2003, p. xi and 3.0)

### **5.6 Local government partnerships**

Attention needs to be paid to relations between TLAs and Regional Councils and other agencies/sectors; see *Report to Government*, F.2.3, p.xi. This could go well with material on organisational capacity and institutional arrangements above.

### **5.7 Environmental outcomes – definition/articulation in plans**

The indifferent performance for identifying/stating anticipated environmental outcomes or results (AERs), as reported in the PUCM reports, suggests this as a topic. This topic groups well with issue definition, objective setting, research and monitoring (all noted above). The approach would be to show how plans should be drafted iteratively (i.e., moving from issue definition to objectives to AERS/monitoring and back again several times).



## 5.8 *Evaluating the implementation of plans*

This topic can be developed around the draft guidelines (work in progress 21/8/03): see guideline *Monitoring Plan Effectiveness – a practical guide to evaluating policy implementation through the resource consent process*. The case study work is relevant as well as the plan and consent coding protocol/analysis. Teaching people how to carry out a rigorous internal case study would be fruitful.

## 6. PDP MATRICES

A series of matrices have been designed as an aid to developing the PDP. They bring together in different combinations, depending on the intended audience, the related aspects of:

- Outputs (e.g. training relevant personnel),
- Methods (e.g. workshops), and
- Instructional Materials (e.g. *Guidelines*).

Table 1 illustrates the matrix approach for all PUCM Outputs for Objective 4 without distinguishing audiences within Output. Further work is required for the other matrices.

## 7. INITIAL PRIORITIES AND APPROACH

The implementation of the PDP requires attention to a range of approaches and setting of priorities through the period 2004-6. In general the criteria for deciding approaches and priorities are:

- Requests for action from stakeholders/interested parties (e.g. MfE or Local Government NZ)
- Initiatives that have a longer lead time and need to be started as soon as possible (e.g. setting up Tertiary Peer Review)
- Previous commitments to provide workshops etc have been made
- PUCM Phase 1 & 2 publications (e.g. *Guidelines*) are available
- the needs of the audience e.g., second generation regional policy statements are underway, as are some district plans. Council elections are this year, which might dictate timing of some matters. LGA deadlines are relevant too.

(Note: these criteria do not apply to meetings and other activities required in the programme for PUCM 3 Objectives such as Peer Review meetings and hui.)

On the basis of the above criteria the following priorities form the work programme for 2004 (priority shown by order of listing):

- Local Govt. workshop (multi-venue) on *Plan-Making in New Zealand*, based on *A Guide to Plan-Making in New Zealand: The Next Generation*.
- Local Govt. seminar (three venues) on PUCM lessons for implementing the Local Government Act 2002, with emphasis on the preparation of Long-Term Council Community Plans. To be based on the report by Borrie, Memon et al 2004.
- Tertiary Educational workshop (single venue) on PUCM-inspired developments of curricula. Materials to be prepared.

**Table 1: General PDP Matrix**

	METHODS				INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS		
	Workshop	Lecture	PUCM website	Quality Planning	Guidelines	Worksheets	Articles
Training relevant personnel to use innovative practice and tools	√	√	√	√	A Guide to Plan-Making in New Zealand: The Next Generation, <i>PUCM 1 Guideline</i> , Jan. 2003	Plan Evaluation: Internal Consistency, <i>PUCM 1 Teaching Resource</i> , Oct. 2003	[Proposed] The argument for training in Capability Building in Plan-making and Implementation [by TF]
Promoting tertiary education developments	√	√	√				
Providing lessons from PUCM for developing long-term community planning	√	√	√	√			
Contributing to PUCM website			√	√			