

NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR SYNOD 2026

1. Speaking Rights

The President to move

That speaking, but non-voting rights are, for the duration of this session of Synod, granted to the following persons:

Mr Alex Summerlee	Legal Advisor
Mr Ed Duggan	Diocesan Finance Manager
Mrs Margaret Soderberg	Chair, Nelson Diocesan Trust Board
Mr Laurie Gabites	Chair, Anglican Care Committee
Dr Kate Tyler	Acting Dean, Bishopdale Theological College
Ms Jen Lun	Operations and Projects Officer, Anglican Missions
Rev Fraser McDermott	Chair, Standing Committee, Anglican Community of St Mark
Rev Lucy Flatt	Standing Committee, Anglican Community of St Mark
Rev Josh Taylor	Standing Committee, Anglican Community of St Mark

2. Diocesan Reports

The President to move

That the Diocesan Reports be received

3. Parish Levy*¹

Rev Marge Tefft To move
Mr Alastair Smith to Second

That this Synod:

- a. Resolve that, commencing with the 2028 levy year, the Parish Levy be apportioned between parishes and ministry units on the basis of each parish's **Average Assessable Income calculated over the preceding three financial years**, using the definition of Assessable Income approved by Standing Committee from time to time;
- b. Resolve that the 2027 levy year be treated as a **transitional year**, during which levy allocations shall be calculated under arrangements determined by Standing Committee in preparation for full implementation of the new methodology in 2028;
- c. Authorise Standing Committee to finalise and publish the detailed definition of Assessable Income, including the treatment of restricted income, capital income, trust capital distributions, bequests, grants and other excluded income categories, consistent with the principles presented to Synod; and
- d. Thank the parishes and ministry units that participated in the consultation process.

4. The Budget

*Rev Marge Tefft to move
Mrs Helen Neame to second*

1. That the report of the 2027 budget be received
2. That the schedule of Parish and Mission Units Levy Contributions for 2027 be approved subject to Motion 3.
3. That the 2027 budget be approved, noting the unsustainability of the deficit and reserve use.

5. Diocesan Overseas Mission Council Act 2004

*Mrs Helen Neame to move
Rt Rev Richard Ellena to second*

That this Synod:

1. Continues the suspension of the Diocesan Overseas Mission Council (DOMC) Act 2004 until Synod 2027;
2. Approves the incorporation of the DOMC Act 2004 repeal and function transfer into the scheduled 2027 review of the Parishes Statute 2006;
3. Notes that Helen Neame will continue as Diocesan Overseas Missions Coordinator; and
4. Directs that formal consultation be undertaken with key stakeholders prior to the 2027 review.

6. Diocesan Missions Quota 2027

*Mrs Helen Neame to move
Rt Rev Richard Ellena to second*

Motion

That this Synod accepts the recommendation of the Diocesan Missions Coordinator the 2027 Anglican Missions funding be set at \$80,000.

7. Review of the Youth Rep Function at Synod

*Rev Brad Wood to move
Rev Jude Saxon to second*

Preamble

The Youth Representative role at Synod is an important opportunity for the Diocese to hear and honour the voice of young people within its key governance gathering. Synod is where significant decisions are made about the life and direction of the Diocese, and it is right that the perspectives of rangatahi (young people) and young adults are represented in that space.

The role appears to serve two important purposes. Firstly, it provides a platform for the voice, experience, and concerns of young people to be heard and advocated for at Synod. Secondly, it offers a valuable leadership development opportunity for emerging leaders, giving them exposure to governance, decision-making, and the wider life of the Church.

At the same time, there are real questions about whether the current structure is fully fit for purpose. Synod is designed primarily as a space for adults experienced in governance, and for many younger people it may be their first significant experience of church governance. Without appropriate preparation, support, and clarity about the purpose of the role, this can be intimidating rather than formational.

There is also a need to consider how youth representation is encouraged not only at Synod, but also at parish and local governance levels. If young people are to be meaningfully represented in diocesan governance, then attention should also be given to how their voices are heard in vestries, working groups, and other parish decision-making spaces.

This motion asks Standing Committee to review the purpose, structure, and function of the Youth Representative role. The aim is to clarify who the role is for, how young people and their advocates are selected and supported, and how the Diocese can best serve, form, and listen to young people as members of the body of Christ and participants in the mission of the Church.

Motion

That this Synod resolves:

1. That Standing Committee review the purpose, function, and structure of the Youth Representative role at Synod.
2. That this review considers how the role can best provide for the voice, experience, and concerns of rangatahi (young people) and young adults to be heard within Synod.
3. That this review considers how the role can serve as a meaningful leadership development opportunity, including questions of age, preparation, support, formation, and who the role is most appropriately for.
4. That this review considers how the voice of rangatahi (young people) and young adults might also be encouraged within parish governance, including vestries, ministry teams, and working groups.
5. That Standing Committee consult with appropriate people, including Diocesan Ministry Coordinator for Youth & Young Adults, youth workers, current or recent Youth Representatives, and emerging young leaders, and bring any recommendations to Synod 2027.

8. Structures Statute Amendment Bill 2026

*Ms Laura Fear to move
Ms Annie Fraser to second*

That this Synod assents to the Structures Statute Amendment Statute 2026

Rationale: To clarify the role of the Risk & Assurance Committee

9. Parishes Statute 2006 Amendment Bill 2026

*President to move
Ms Laura Fear to second*

That this Synod assents to the Parishes Statute 2006 Amendment Statute 2026

10. Motion of Thanks - Emmaus Training

*Mr Philip Booth to move
Ms Sue Roper to second*

The Parish of Cobden-Runanga would like to formally thank all those who were involved in the organisation and running of the Emmaus Training Event held at Holy Trinity Greymouth this July and would encourage something similar on a possible biennial basis.

***1 Parish Levy**

Introduction

Synod 2025 asked Standing Committee to review the way that the Parish Levy was allocated across the parishes. Synod had heard that the current system, based on overall population within a parish, was no longer equitable and particularly disadvantaged large parishes (such as Motueka) without taking into account parish income.

Seven options were consulted on with parishes. Feedback was sought over August and September to inform a paper to synod.

The options presented were:

- Status quo - 5 Yearly Census Data
- Sunday Church Attendance - Three years average
- Number of Direct Credit and Envelope Givers - Three Years Average
- Average Last Three Years Total Income
- Average Last Three Years Assessable Income
- Average Last Three Years Total Expenditure - Three Years average
- Average Last Three Years Assessable Expenditure

Based on assessment against the developed principles (agreed with Standing Committee in February 2026) the preferred option was Option 5.

Parishes feedback described the proposal as fair, transparent and relatively easy to administer and appreciated that the proposed formula is more aligned with ability to pay. The methodology:

- Better reflects a parish's actual resources.
- Aligns contribution levels with financial capacity.
- Is fairer than the current system.
- Provides a more transparent basis for levy allocation.
- Avoids distorting effects from exceptional or one-off income.

There was broad consensus that the current system is no longer fit for purpose. Key themes identified included:

- Population bears little relationship to church attendance.
- Population does not reflect parish giving levels.
- Population does not reflect financial capacity.
- Population does not account for socioeconomic differences between parish communities.

Transitional arrangements

Transitional arrangements were proposed to smooth the impact of the levy in those parishes facing a significant increase.

There was no clear consensus, with responses ranging from none to 3 years. Parishes most affected have suggested a one-year transition. This would involve half the increase in 2027 followed by full transition in 2028.

What is included/excluded as assessable income?

Assessable	Non-assessable
• ordinary offerings; • unrestricted donations; • diocesan and 3rd party grants that contribute to general ministry or staff costs • trust income available for general ministry or staff costs; • rental, hall and venue income; • income from weddings and funerals; • ordinary programme fees; • other unrestricted fundraising and trading income; and • other recurring receipts available for general parish purposes.	• tagged donations for property, mission and external-beneficiaries; • all other diocesan and 3rd party grants and contributions, including property and capital grants; • all other trust income, including property-related • bequests • trust capital distributions; • accounting revaluations; • asset disposal gains; and • capital-project fundraising.

Overall Assessment

The consultation demonstrates an unusually high level of agreement across responding parishes and ministry units.

Key conclusions are:

- No respondent has opposed the proposed methodology.
- All respondents support moving away from a population-based levy.
- All respondents support linking levy allocation more closely to financial capacity.
- Respondents consistently identify fairness and ability to pay as the guiding principles.
- There is broad agreement that Average Assessable Income provides the fairest and most transparent methodology.
- Discussion has focused primarily on implementation details rather than the merits of the proposal itself.