

Appendix 2 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions (Genetically Modified Organisms)

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|---|--|----------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| S511.105 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support | Forest & Bird support a precautionary approach to GMO. It accepts that rigorously contained research into GMA methods of pest and weed can take place under strict conditions of consent. | Retain chapter | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS164.105 | Scrumptious Fruit Trust | | Support | <p>Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p> | Allow | Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred). | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS570.1676 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS572.001 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | | Support | Support because this part of the F & B submission (S511.05) is consistent with our original submission, and a precautionary approach to any laboratory GE/ GMO experiments or | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|--|----------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>outdoor GE/GMO experiments is highly necessary.</p> <p>Adverse impacts of GMOs (including CRISPR/ gene edited organisms or sterility technique "gene drive") may be irreversible. We prefer outdoor GE/GMO experiments and field trials to be prohibited due to the significant risks and the fact that adverse impacts may be irreversible.</p> <p>We would appreciate clarification as to what "GMA" stands for.</p> | | | | |
| FS566.1690 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS569.1712 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| S442.124 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous | Support | Forest & Bird support a precautionary approach to GMO. It accepts that rigorously contained research into GMA methods of pest and weed can take place under strict conditions of consent. | Retain chapter. | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS572.002 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | | Support | Support because this part of the S442 submission is consistent with our original submission as well as Forest & Birds submission, and a precautionary approach to any laboratory GE/ GMO experiments or outdoor GE/GMO experiments is highly necessary. Adverse impacts of GMOs (including CRISPR/ gene edited organisms or sterility technique "gene drive") may be irreversible. We prefer outdoor GE/GMO experiments and field trials to be prohibited due to the | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | significant risks and the fact that adverse impacts may be irreversible. | | | | |
| FS346.735 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Support | The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission. | Allow | Allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| S421.200 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Overview | Support | Federated Farmers supports the use of the precautionary approach and the use of adaptive responses which has been adopted by the Council in terms of the use of genetically modified organisms. | Retain the precautionary approach and the use of adaptive response | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS570.1432 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS80.8 | GE Free Northland | | Support | This specific part of the Northland Federated Farmers of NZ original submission is in alignment with our original submission (GE Free Northland). We support the precautionary approach to any outdoor GE/GMO applications, we support truly sustainable integrated management, we support the Precautionary Principle, we support councils excellent precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies, and rules in the District Plan. We support FNDC's fiscally responsible, precautionary, collaborative, regional approach to the risks of any outdoor GE/GMO applications. | Allow | | Accept | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS346.434 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | Society of New Zealand Inc. | | | functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | | | | Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS566.1446 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS569.1468 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| S433.001 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | Overview | Support | This excellent FNDC GE/GMO policy reflects Far North Districts farmer/primary producer and other ratepayer/residents wishes and aspirations, sets council policy direction, helps protect our existing valuable GE/GMO free status, as well as financial/budgetary requirements. | Retain the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions/policies/rules in the operative FNDC District Plan (as a result of successful GE/GMO plan change #18, undertaken in a fiscally responsible collaborative process with Whangarei District Council - WDC PC #131) being placed in the new Far North District Plan. | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS570.1461 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS566.1475 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS569.1497 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| S433.003 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | Overview | Oppose | We stress that gene edited organisms (CRISPR controversial technique) are genetically modified organisms under NZ law and as ruled by the highest court in the EU. Gene edited organisms have been shown (various independent | Amend to note that controversial and risky gene edited organism (CRISPR technique) are GMOs. | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|--|------------------------|---|
| | | | | reports and peer reviewed scientific papers to have unexpected/unforeseen, off target adverse effects (undesirable traits manifesting in the organism)) and should not be allowed in Far North District or the wider region. | | | | |
| FS570.1463 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issur 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS80.4 | GE Free Northland | | Support | Our community group wishes FNDC to clearly note (in the context of the valuable precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules) that GMOs (Genetically Modified Organisms) include risky CRISPR/ gene edited organisms. This should not be difficult as the risky genetic technique CRISPR (gene edited organisms) are GMOs under NZ law. CRISPR is short for "clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats" and has been shown to cause unintended/ unforseen "off target" adverse effects in experiments overseas. | Allow | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issur 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS566.1477 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issur 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS569.1499 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issur 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| S433.004 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | Overview | Oppose | While we strongly support robust protection of native flora and fauna, use of such risky new genetic technologies on our public | Amend to oppose any outdoor use of risky and controversial gene edited organisms (CRISPR) or "gene drive" (a sterility technique that presents grave risks to NZ's | | Reject | Section 5.2.2 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | | conservation lands (or elsewhere) would be counter productive and potentially create far more serious problems than it solves. | biosecurity, indigenous biodiversity, and wider environment). | | | Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS570.1464 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Support | Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions. | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS566.1478 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| FS569.1500 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Support | Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Allow | Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.2 Key Issue 2: Definitions and inclusions |
| S462.001 | Rolf Mueller-Glodde | Overview | Support in part | I fully support the status quo of the chapter on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) as the most appropriate way to manage the issue with changes only relating to the structure, layout and minor amendment to rule language, to align with the new format of the other chapters. | Retain the chapter (Genetically Modified Organisms Chapter) as proposed. | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS80.3 | GE Free Northland | | Support | Our community group supports this Far North ratepayers' excellent submission, which urges FNDC to retain the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules in the operative District Plan...and place into the proposed District Plan. Retain the chapter (Genetically Modified Organisms Chapter) as proposed, with only minor changes to align with other relevant chapters in the interest of truly sustainable integrated management, protection of our biosecurity, indigenous biodiversity, our wider environment, existing GM free primary | Allow | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | producers and their valuable enterprises, our economy, cultural values, growing organic sector/ Hua parakore and food sovereignty | | | | |
| FS80.6 | GE Free Northland | | Support | This submission is in alignment with our original submission. Totally support | Allow | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS572.003 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | | Support | Support because this part of the S462 submission is consistent with our original submission, and a precautionary approach to any laboratory GE/ GMO experiments or outdoor GE/GMO experiments is highly necessary. We agree that the FNDC chapter on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) "is the most appropriate way to manage the issue with changes only relating to the structure, layout and minor amendment to rule language, to align with the new format of the other chapters | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| S421.201 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | GMO-O1 | Support | Federated Farmers supports the use of the precautionary approach and the use of adaptive responses which has been adopted by the Council in terms of the use of genetically modified organisms. | Retain the precautionary approach outlined in Objective GMO-O1 | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS61.2 | Vision Kerikeri 1 | | Support | I agree to retain the precautionary rules as stated also by the submitter Northland Federated Farmers in SS421.201 but oppose S421.203 | Allow | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS570.1433 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS572.0010 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | | Support | <p>We support this specific section (S421.202 and S421.201) as it is consistent with part of our original submission. The use of the precautionary approach and FNDC's adaptive, fiscally responsible, and collaborative approach to the risks of any outdoor GE/GMO experiments/ field trials/ releases is highly appropriate. FNDC's approach is consistent with the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules in the operative FNDC District Plan and in alignment with the FNDC precautionary and prohibitive, collaborative and regional approach to the risks of GE/GMOs.</p> <p>FNDC's approach is also in alignment with the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules in the operative Whangarei District Plan. FNDC undertook GE/GMO Plan change #18 collaboratively with Whangarei District Council (Plan change #131).</p> <p>FNDC's approach is also in alignment with the findings of the Northland / Auckland INTER COUNCIL WORKING PARTY ON GMO RISK EVALUATION & MANAGEMENT OPTIONS (of which FNDC is a member).</p> <p>For information on the work of the Northland/Auckland "Inter Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation & Management Options" see Whangarei District Council GENETIC ENGINEERING REVIEW http://www.wdc.govt.nz/PlansPoliciesandBylaws/Plans/Genetic-Engineering/Pages/default.aspx</p> | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | We note that the Northland regional documents have precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules. The Northland RPS deals with the overarching Policy and through the operative Regional Plan deals with those areas not covered by the District Plans ie. the Coastal Marine Areas. We note that District Councils must give effect to the provisions of the Regional Policy Statements (must implement). District Plans can not be contrary to Regional Plans. | | | | |
| FS346.435 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS566.1447 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS569.1469 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| S421.202 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | GMO-P1 | Support | Federated Farmers supports the use of the precautionary approach and the use of adaptive responses which has been adopted by the Council in terms of the use of genetically modified organisms. | Retain the precautionary approach outlined in Policy GMO-P1 | | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS570.1434 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| FS572.009 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | | Support | <p>We support this specific section (S421.202 and S421.201) as it is consistent with part of our original submission. The use of the precautionary approach and FNDC's adaptive, fiscally responsible, and collaborative approach to the risks of any outdoor GE/GMO experiments/ field trials/ releases is highly appropriate. FNDC's approach is consistent with the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules in the operative FNDC District Plan and in alignment with the FNDC precautionary and prohibitive, collaborative and regional approach to the risks of GE/GMOs.</p> <p>FNDC's approach is also in alignment with the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules in the operative Whangarei District Plan. FNDC undertook GE/GMO Plan change #18 collaboratively with Whangarei District Council (Plan change #131).</p> <p>FNDC's approach is also in alignment with the findings of the Northland / Auckland INTER COUNCIL WORKING PARTY ON GMO RISK EVALUATION & MANAGEMENT OPTIONS (of which FNDC is a member).</p> <p>For information on the work of the Northland/Auckland "Inter Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation & Management Options" see Whangarei District Council GENETIC ENGINEERING REVIEW http://www.wdc.govt.nz/PlansPoliciesandBylaws/Plans/Genetic-</p> | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>Engineering/Pages/default.aspx</p> <p>We note that the Northland regional documents have precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules.</p> <p>The Northland RPS deals with the overarching Policy and through the operative Regional Plan deals with those areas not covered by the District Plans ie. the Coastal Marine Areas.</p> <p>We note that District Councils must give effect to the provisions of the Regional Policy Statements (must implement). District Plans can not be contrary to Regional Plans.</p> | | | | |
| FS346.436 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS566.1448 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS569.1470 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Reject | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| S304.001 | Ngati Rangī ki Ngawha Hapu | GMO-P1 | Support in part | <p>As reiterated in Ngati Rangī Policy regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms:</p> <p>3.4.1 The Ngāti Rangī rohe will remain free of G.E. and G.M.O. This includes but is not limited to:</p> <p>a. animal and plant gene manipulation;</p> <p>b. any G.E. field trials, and</p> | Amend to ensure consistency with Ngati Rangī Policy regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms (3.4.1): The Ngāti Rangī rohe will remain free of G.E. and G.M.O. This includes but is not limited to: | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | | c. any food containing anything from a G.E and G.M.O origin. Furthermore then reiterated in Ngati Rangī Rules regarding Genetic engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms: 3.4.1.1 Genetic engineering is prohibited within the Ngāti Rangī rohe, including any animal or plant gene manipulation. This will include any introduction of G.E. species. | c. any food containing anything from a G.E and G.M.O origin. | | | |
| FS80.1 | GE Free Northland | | Support | Support because this part of the Ngati Rangī ki Ngawha hapu submission (S511.05) is consistent with our original submission, and a precautionary and prohibitive policy regarding outdoor GE/GMO experiments is highly necessary. Support because GE Free Tai Tokerau supports the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policies of all Tai Tokerau iwi/ hapu for their respective rohe. Support because of our concerns about any genetic engineering/ modification of native taonga species, including but not limited to manuka and kauri. | Allow | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS572.005 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | | Support | Support because this part of the Ngati Rangī ki Ngawha hapu submission (S511.05) is consistent with our original submission, and a precautionary and prohibitive policy regarding outdoor GE/GMO experiments is highly necessary. Support because GE Free Tai Tokerau supports the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policies of all Tai Tokerau iwi/ hapu for their respective rohe. Support because of our concerns about any genetic engineering/ modification of native | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | taonga species, including but not limited to manuka and kauri. | | | | |
| S515.006 | Ngati Rangi ki Ngawha | GMO-P1 | Support in part | As reiterated in Ngati Rangi Policy regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms: 3.4.1 The Ngāti Rangi rohe will remain free of G.E. and G.M.O. This includes but is not limited to: a. animal and plant gene manipulation; b. any G.E. field trials, and c. any food containing anything from a G.E and G.M.O origin. Furthermore then reiterated in Ngati Rangi Rules regarding Genetic engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms: 3.4.1.1 Genetic engineering is prohibited within the Ngāti Rangi rohe, including any animal or plant gene manipulation. This will include any introduction of G.E. species. | Amend to ensure consistency with Ngati Rangi Policy regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms (3.4.1): The Ngāti Rangi rohe will remain free of G.E. and G.M.O. This includes but is not limited to: a. animal and plant gene manipulation; b. any G.E. field trials, and c. any food containing anything from a G.E and G.M.O origin. | | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| FS572.006 | GE Free Tai Tokerau | | Support | Support because this part of the Ngati Rangi ki Ngawha hapu submission (S511.05) is consistent with our original submission, and a precautionary and prohibitive policy regarding outdoor GE/GMO experiments is highly necessary. Support because GE Free Tai Tokerau supports the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policies of all Tai Tokerau iwi/ hapu for their respective rohe. Support because of our concerns about any genetic engineering/ modification of native taonga species, including but not limited to manuka and kauri. | Allow | allow the original submission | Accept in part | Section 5.2.3 Key Issue 3: Provisions |
| S421.203 | Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Rules | Oppose | Federated Farmers is not supportive of Councils dealing with genetically modified organisms through a restrictive process. The Environmental | Delete the restrictions on the control and management of genetically modified organisms and replace with reference to the processes and controls imposed by the EPA | | Reject | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: GMO Chapter scope in relation to HSNO |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | Protection Authority (EPA) has been tasked with the control and management of genetically modified organisms. For Councils to then seek to restrict these organisms results in the doubling the consenting process and paperwork for a farmer as well as unnecessary duplication. The EPA controls the consent process which is strictly monitored and restricted to ensure that the trials are successful and do not cause damage to the environment and local communities. | | | | |
| FS61.1 | Vision Kerikeri 1 | | Oppose | Council needs any available method to enforce the pre-cautionary approach. Council's restriction does not duplicate any process, because any application for use of GE/GMO will be deemed unsuccessful. The rules are thus very clear for all farmers. I seek the following relief: retain as proposed in the draft PDP | Disallow | | Support | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: GMO Chapter scope in relation to HSNO |
| FS570.1435 | Vision Kerikeri 3 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions. | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Support | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: GMO Chapter scope in relation to HSNO |
| FS80.7 | GE Free Northland | | Oppose | Our community group (GE Free Northland) opposes this specific section (421.003 GE/GMOs issue) in the original submission by S421 Northland Federated Farmers of NZ. We oppose this part of the S421 submission (S421.003) because it is inconsistent with our original submission, and the relief we seek. Northland Federated Farmers and head office (Federated Farmers of NZ) falsely states that FNDC's fiscally responsible and collaborative GE/GMO | Disallow | | Support | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: GMO Chapter scope in relation to HSNO |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>provisions, policies and rules are "unnecessary duplication."</p> <p>The findings of the Northland/ Auckland INTER COUNCIL WORKING PARTY ON GMO RISK EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS (of which FNDC is a full member since its inception in 2003), Local Government NZ, and many other councils (including Hastings District Council, Bay of Plenty Regional Council, Nelson City Council) clearly show significant deficiencies in the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act and multiple failures by the central government regulator (ERMA/ EPA).</p> <p>Deficiencies in HSNO include inadequate liability provisions and no mandatory requirement by the EPA to take a precautionary approach to outdoor GE/GMO applications.</p> <p>It has also been documented that in a number of cases MAF/MPI failed to adequately monitor ERMA/EPA rubber stamped outdoor GE/GMO field trials, including Plant and Food Research's GE brassica trial.</p> <p>Local councils creating an additional tier of protection against the risks of outdoor GE/GMO experiments, field trials, conditional release (and banning full release) is highly necessary and in keeping with the wishes of the majority of their ratepayers and residents.</p> <p>The responsible action of FNDC (and the other Northland/ Auckland councils) serves to help protect not only existing GM free primary producers and their</p> | | | | |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|-------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>valuable enterprises, but our biosecurity, indigenous biodiversity, wider environment, existing GM free primary producers (conventional, IPM and organic), food sovereignty, economy, and cultural values.</p> <p>Three major reports commissioned by the Northland/Auckland Working party have identified a range of risks involved with the outdoor trialling and release of GMOs. They also include approaches to managing those risks.</p> <p>Northland Federated Farmers and head office (Federated Farmers of NZ) should be conversant with the above information and case law, given Federated Farmers repeated failures in the courts (attempting to stop local councils from placing precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies and rules in local plans). Federated Farmers lost every single case in the Environment Court, High Court, Court of Appeal and Environment Court. Significant documentation provided in our further submission lodged with FNDC Via email, more details can be provided on request.</p> | | | | |
| FS346.437 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | | Oppose | The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. | Disallow | Disallow the original submission | Support | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: GMO Chapter scope in relation to HSNO |
| FS566.1449 | Kapiro Conservation Trust 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Support | Section 5.2.1 |

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

| Submission Point | Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS) | Provision | Position | Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | | Officer recommendation | Relevant section of s42A report |
|------------------|--|-----------|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Key Issue 1: GMO Chapter scope in relation to HSNO |
| FS569.1471 | Vision Kerikeri 2 | | Oppose | Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Disallow | Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission | Support | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: GMO Chapter scope in relation to HSNO |
| FS589.002 | Kapiro Conservation Trust | | Oppose | The precautionary approach in the PDP is appropriate in GMO-P1 | Disallow | We seek that the whole submission point be disallowed | Support | Section 5.2.1 Key Issue 1: GMO Chapter scope in relation to HSNO |