

New Zealand Land Use Steering Group (NZLUSG)

Thank you for offering to participate in the NZLUSG. We are delighted to have you in our group.

We plan to convene two meetings prior to the release of the 2026 land use map. These meetings are intended to direct any changes to the land use classification system (NZLUM) that this land use map implements. This map production will be conducted by the BSI under contract to MfE.

The total time commitment expected from you by June 2026 is less than ten hours, including this first 2.5 hour remote meeting. **To benefit the most from each other's time, please come prepared for a productive first meeting, likely to be held in late January.**

Draft Agenda

Time	Agenda item	Person	Actions
1:00	Welcome & refresher	Richard Law (BSI)	
1:10	Introductions	All	Apologies noted
1:20	Requirements gathering	All Each participant to explain interest in the land use classification and dataset	Requirements noted
1:45	Questions from preparation	Led by Richard Law (BSI)	Change proposals recorded, if consensus obtained
	Adequacy of the taxonomy		
	Tertiary classes to prioritise for mapping		
	Attributes		
	Commodities		
	Management practices		
	Data structure		
	Formal specification (ISO 19144-3:2024)		
2:45	Online survey results & discussion	Led by James Ardo (BSI)	Change proposals recorded, if consensus obtained
3:10	Open floor	All	Discussions noted
3:25	Organise Meeting 2	Led by Richard Law (BSI)	Meeting date agreed
3:30	Close		

Attendees

Person	Organisation	Notes
Robert Cardwell	Market.Economics	
Haydon Jones	Waikato RC	
Craig Briggs	Waikato RC	
Ashton Eaves	Hawkes Bay RC	
Greg Byrom	LINZ	
Deb Burgess	MfE	
Anne-Gaelle Ausseil	MfE	
Richard Law	BSI (MWLR)	Convener
James Ardo	BSI (MWLR)	
Stella Belliss	BSI (MWLR)	Optional

Preparation for the first meeting

1. Please become reasonably familiar with the contents of the NZLUM website, <https://nzlum.landcareresearch.co.nz>
 - a. In particular, **spend time considering the NZLUM v0.3 classification system**, especially its taxonomy and schema, detailed at <https://nzlum.landcareresearch.co.nz/classification/v0-3/system/>
 - b. If you'd prefer a demonstration, note that the pilot 2025 land use map implements the NZLUM v0.3 specification system, see <https://iris.scinfo.org.nz/layer/122805-new-zealand-land-use-management-version-03-nzlum-v03/> noting that this implementation is incomplete (e.g. only a few tertiary classes are implemented).
 - c. Also consider the precedent for NZLUM, ALUM v8: <https://www.agriculture.gov.au/abares/aclump/land-use/alum-classification>
2. In preparation for the 2026 land use map, that continues towards a full implementation of the specification, the Steering Group is asked to consider the following issues. Please spend some time considering your perspective and come prepared to share it. Please also feel free to come with clarifying questions. Your answers to some of the leading questions may be simple, others complex.
 - a. **Is the taxonomy (the classes, their definitions and arrangement) adequate?**
 - i. Is the hierarchical arrangement of classes into primary and secondary groups sensible?
 - ii. Should particular classes be moved?
 - iii. What classes are missing?
 - iv. Should some classes be combined, or removed?
 - v. Are the definitions of the classes adequate?
 - vi. Fundamentally, does it make sense to have definitions of classes that exist independently of the implementation detail (such as references to specific input datasets)?
 - b. A full implementation of all classes is unlikely for the 2026 map due to resource and time constraints. **But which classes are the most valuable and/or most realistic to implement first?**
 - c. **Attributes**
 - i. Information in NZLUM is divided into a classification taxonomy with supplementary categorical attributes. Do attributes make taxonomy easier or harder to use?

- ii. The list of attributes that could be considered is endless. The draft specification includes one for “permeability”, which is presently left unimplemented in the pilot map due to lack of data. Should the “permeability” attribute be retained? Why?
- iii. Are there other attributes that we should include? If so, why should these form part of the NZLUM specification, rather than being extensions to it?

d. Commodities

- i. What commodities are of particular value?
- ii. What data can be leveraged to support their identification?

e. Management practices

- i. What management practices are of particular value?
- ii. What data can be leveraged to support their identification?

f. Data structure

- i. Input data geographic scale: is the proposed data type suitable? Currently it uses an integer range using interval notation, e.g. [10,50] indicates that the precision of input data is in the range 10-50 m (inclusive).
 - ii. Input data temporal range: is the proposed data type suitable? Currently, interval notation is used, e.g. [2011-05-02,2025-01-03) indicates that source information from this temporal range was used in the classification decision.
 - iii. Data sources (organisations) are minimally listed but using no controlled list of terms. Is this adequate? Is this useful? What is an alternative?
 - g. How formally should the NZLUM specification be defined? Specifically, **should NZLUM be described in terms of the ISO 19144-3:2024 Land Use Meta Language (LUML)? <https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/a3d60658-374b-475d-8c35-0290057d8358>**
3. Please feel free to **bring your own questions, concerns, use cases, and comments to share** with the Steering Group in an open floor discussion. If you would like to add something to the agenda, please email us at landuse@landcareresearch.co.nz before the meeting.

