

Summary of Submissions to Ministry of Fisheries Obligations to Maori – Services Design Review, Dec 2009 (categorised by issue)

1 MFish Resource Allocation

Geographical location of staff – general

- Relaxed on position placement but support 12 month review to see if working;
- Allowing flexibility for staff to decide on locations;
- Some regions appear to have preference of resources;
- Support Pou (in current locations);
- Need clearer rationale for geographical locations (including freshwater issues eg, on Waikato and other rivers in central North Island);
- Need to have flexibility around geographical allocations to ensure the best person for job is able to be employed;
- Rationale for boundaries for Pou Hononga needs to be clearer (and preferably be discussed with tangata whenua);
- Supported existing resource allocation – concern that proposed changes will reduce capacity of whanau/hapu and marae to manage non-commercial customary locally;
- Need continuity of individuals to maintain good relationships;
- Concern about apparent retrenchment of staff to Wellington;
- Pou staff need to work at hapu not iwi level. Concern at losing access to local Pou staff who have very good relations and experience with working with particular Forums and hapu;
- Inter-iwi relationships and compliance at risk;
- Disputes should not be managed by staff from outside of region;

Geographical location – specific (NB: names of individual staff members have been removed)

Taitokerau/Tamaki

- Insufficient funds for 300 hapu of Nga Puhi;
- Mid north and far north can be serviced adequately from Whangarei;
- The new structure promotes iwi operating outside of their current isolation or silo to join other iwi of the north and eventually the FMA;
- Muriwhenua/Kaitaia want to retain the services of their own Pou Hononga;
- Whangarei is best location for a Pou Hononga position as is central to all iwi in Northland making service delivery effective and efficient;
- Big challenges in Taitokerau for Kai Takawaenga so dedicate at least one Kai Takawaenga to Te Taitokerau;
- Retain all services within Te Hiku o te Ika to allow this region to build capacity and capability to meet iwi customary aspirations; retain Pou Hononga services in Kaitaia;
- Clear from the Auckland hui that the Forum involved do not yet have the capacity to input competently into MFish processes and they wanted their Pou staff for ongoing support. Careful consideration of the withdrawal of staff from those areas is needed;
- Want to retain staff in the area and maintain the PH support they have had to date (te Hiku o te Ika);
- Keep PH in Kaitaia and they can service south to Whangarei. Meet with Auckland to service Whangarei Nth;
- Te Runanga o Te Rarawa forum shouldn't be serviced from Whangarei when there is no recognised forum in te Taitokerau;

- Suggest flexibility of location for Auckland region staff (best service to iwi);
- Support for work that local Pou Hononga has done in Bay of Islands;
- Support Iwi fisheries plans approach – concerned with capacity in Tai Tokerau. Te Uri O Hau and Te Roroa have protocols and can move now. Propose assigning Kai Takawaenga position to Whangarei and training and development for existing staff to take new roles;
- Te Hiku Forum expressed concern that the Far North would be marginalised by losing access to Pou staff. The far North is working on similar issues to the proposal but would lose traction if Pou staff based in Auckland or Whangarei and not readily available to work with iwi;
- Have received outstanding support from local Pou Hononga in mid North - keen to retain;
- How does Mfish expect one PH in Whangarei to cope with the workload?
- Kaitaia office to service south to Whangarei and Auckland to service north to Whangarei which would cover Ngapuhi who have no forum;
- Belief that New Zealand stops at Whangarei has proven to be detrimental to development and progress of Te Hiku o te Ika. The perception is that Te Hiku is isolated and disadvantaged;

Waikato

- Need sufficient flexibility to retain local Waikato Pou (range of options - customary positions or TP advisor);
- Strong support from Nga Hapu o te Uru for work of their Pou Hononga and Pou Takawaenga; strongly request that these positions remain in Hamilton;
- Want 2 staff to be located in Hamilton to support River management; want to maintain kanohi ki te kanohi contact (via staff in Hamilton);

BOP

- Wish to retain current Pou Hononga/Takawaenga;
- Support retention of Pou Hononga in Tauranga;
- BOP Forum wants position in Tauranga to support Forum not Auckland;

Lower North Island

- If two lower North Island Forums merge want current Pou Takawaenga to remain.
- Chathams should be serviced out of the lower North Island (stronger tribal connections, and use NI regulations);
- Strong support for work of local Pou Takawaenga in Napier (and wish to retain her services);

South Island/ Ngai Tahu

- Retain 4.5FTEs in the PT role for Ngai Tahu;
- There should be a minimum of 4 staff for Ngai Tahu– 3 PT, 1 PH/PT;
- PT staff wish to remain in Nelson, and the Dunedin staff member wants to move to Invercargill;
- Suggest that Ngai Tahu doesn't require a PH and that one of the PT can undertake the PH role for Ngai Tahu and the Chathams;
- The location of the South Island Pou staff is not important, the relationships they have formed with the iwi are important;
- Wish to retain 4 FTEs as KT with 1 FTE taking on the PH role servicing the Sth Island forum and 7 customary fisheries regional forums;
- Can't class Ngai Tahu as 1 iwi for allocation of resources as they cover a large geographical area and 18 runanga;

- Chathams and Sth Island too large for just 1 PH, suggest 1 PH for Te Tau Ihu and Chathams and retain PH function for Ngai Tahu in PT staff;
- Poutini [Ngai Tahu] not well served by geographical allocation;
- Support concept, and proposed South Island locations of KTW (Nelson, Christchurch, Dunedin).

DCE Treaty Partnership

- Reconfirmation of support officer of DCE Treaty into Fisheries Mgmt?
- Treaty partnership advisor –need full range of cultural skills, if based in Wgtn will limit opportunities for some staff to apply (or could use technology to manage), role drives from PH team so they should have preference to apply;
- Who is 2IC to DCE Treaty;
- DCE Treaty to develop monitoring framework, evaluation by external party (RFP), Pou Mgr stand alone position same delegation as IFP Mgr;
- DCE Treaty Partnerships needs support and skills across a range or areas;
- Support person for the DCE Treaty should have cultural awareness;

Pou Hononga – Pou Takawaenga (general)

- Support split of Pou Hononga from Pou Takawaenga;
- Kai Takawaenga rather than Pou Hononga should support the national and regional forums under input and participation processes and Pou Hononga instead of supporting the forums should support customary regulations implementation;
- Ngai Tahu Kai Takawaenga doing both roles due to resignation of Pou Hononga;
- Support creation of IFP analyst roles and integrated spatial and customary management team.
- The merging of the Pou Takawaenga and Pou Hononga roles is of concern. How it will affect continuation of work undertaken by our current staff is unclear.

Pou Hononga/Treaty Partnership Advisor – under DCETP

- Pou Hononga Manager job description is heavy on accountabilities. Role should be at same level as Spatial Manager and should be open to be regionally located;
- Job description for TP Advisor should reflect requirement for experience in Te Ao Maori and position should not be limited to Wellington;
- PH Mgr - should be stand alone ie no rohe to manage, and same delegation and linked to as inshore and IFP mgr. Doesn't have to be Wgtn based;
- Are 5/6 PH enough? Disparity in the regions regarding support and engagement;
- Suggest the team leader (Pou Hononga) manage iwi leaders and national forum groups;
- Concern about large area Pou Hononga are expected to cover; recommend extra Pou Hononga in Far North and South Island (from IFP team) – one in each of Nelson, Christchurch and Dunedin);
- Placing Pou Hononga under DCETP distracts from monitoring role of DCE;
- Pou Hononga manager should not also have to be a direct iwi relationship manager, and should be located in Wellington;
- Consider placing Pou Hononga with Strategy to provide implementation knowledge and to implement settlements; or locate with Spatial Group (in both cases still available to DCTP for relationship management);
- Are 6 Pou Hononga enough; will the new role enable them to adequately support Forums?
- Support establishment of DCTP and monitoring role of DCTP and Pou Hononga (but Pou will need to be trained in monitoring);

Pou Hononga – Customary regulations implementation advisors

- Are three Customary Regulations Advisors enough to implement regulations for both freshwater and marine?
- Pou Hononga should remain in regions to do customary regulations implementation;
- PH should be retained in regions where 27A permits still exist or where transition to Kregs is occurring as part of managing good relationships;
- Propose increasing Customary Regulations Advisors to 3.5 FTE (1.5 for gazette processing, and 2 for education/mediation in North Island) and the Group have a Team Leader who can exercise regulatory delegations and manage entire process;
- Support creation of the Customary Regulations Implementation roles and additional resources being allocated to process kaitiaki appointment and resolve disputes. Placement with the Spatial Allocations Team is reasonable. It would be useful if the two teams could be flexible in their work plans to meet both customary and non-customary tools priorities;
- Customary regulations advisors – advisor role has accountabilities to work with other business groups to implement DOS however there are no agreed processes to achieve this. Positions could be serviced from the regions;
- Concern customary regulation education will not be prioritised and be conducted by staff unaware of regional dynamics;
- Concern over who will pick up the role of education iwi/hapu of the advantages of using the customary regs;
- Suggest CRI positions should be with DCETP (allowing a more holistic approach);

Resources for ongoing customary management

- Who will provide support for mataitai development plans, by laws, reinstating commercial fishing;
- Need to retain resources for non-commercial customary management (rohe moana, Kaitiakitanga, mataitai);
- Need support for management of established mataitai;
- Expectation PH will be available for processes already in motion eg taiapure application;

Spatial Management Group – Customary Regulations Management Tools Advisor

- Spatial Management Manager – ensure position description holds relevant qualifications in tikanga, mātauranga, and maramataka, tahā Maori or a willingness to learn in addition to the requirement for te reo;
- More MFish staff be seconded to help the Spatial Management team process backlog of māitaitai applications rather than proposed one person;
- Implement the proposed changes for Spatial management;
- Spatial Management Manager should have a proven track record in Maori successes;
- Support increase of resource into Spatial team; Manager needs understanding of things Maori;
- Concerns whether number of resources applied to Spatial Management processes will be sufficient to meet objectives set out in proposal;
- Role of customary tools advisor unclear. Appears constrained by government decisions on support for māitaitai reserve applications;
- Do spatial customary advisors need to be in Wellington? Benefits from having access and understanding of hapu/iwi communities and issues;
- Spatial Managers must have skills in Tikanga Maori;
- The proposed Customary Regulations Management Tools Advisor role is unclear and a liaison type role is not necessary and poses a risk of introducing an advocacy role for applicants into an independent assessment role that must be conducted according to administrative law principles;

- Placement of the mediation role in Spatial allocations has little rationale but could be accommodated by the separation of teams to maintain independence of roles;
- There is little difference between the proposed Spatial Management Manager and the current Manager role and therefore no reason for creating a new role and disestablishing the current position;
- Spatial Management Team – Support inclusion of customary tools advisor to assist engagement with iwi;
- Spatial Management and Customary Regulations implementation should have a key focus on developing a full range of skills in Te Ao Maori to give effect to this team;
- How will the integration of PH capabilities in the Spatial team be achieved? Tangata whenua will expect the spatial team to provide effective communication and relationship building and focus more resources on dispute resolution/mediation and customary regulation education;
- Seek further information on roles of the different teams and whether the 4 new positions under the Spatial Management Mgr will process the backlog of mātaimai applications;
- Recommend that customary regulations advisors have a clear link in their work plan to work alongside Pou Manager and PH;
- Unclear that adding resources to spatial group will speed up mataimai application process;
- Support link of customary regulations unit to spatial management; need to speed process for appointing kaitiaki, resolving disputes and processing mataimai applications;

Poutakawaenga/Kaitakawaenga - IFP analysts - IFP Manager (general)

- Diagrams for Fisheries Management Group unclear (text better);
- PTW and IFP analysts must be an integrated part of fisheries management;
- Dual management of IFP analysts problematic; should split management;
- Split reporting lines between IFM and IFP Development Manager but aim to locate IFP analysts, Kai takawaenga and inshore analysts alongside each other;
- Need to ensure clarity of new roles – IFP analysts, Kai Takawaenga;
- Over time should move to Fisheries Analysts and Kai Takawaenga reporting to same team leaders;
- Support IFP Development Mgr and the IFP Analysts and their locations;
- Inshore mgr to manage fisheries analysts, IFP mgr to manage KTW and IFP analysts co-managed by Inshore and IFP Mgr;
- Support - Staff opportunities to develop skills for fisheries management work;
- The joint management of Iwi Fisheries Plans team is confusing and could lead to unclear accountabilities. Rationale and application of the joint team role need clarification;
- Comment – clarification required on management of the Kai Takawaenga, that IFP analysts be managed by IFP Development Manager and IFP analysts be managed by Inshore Manager. Clear IPAs and KRAs will be required for both groups;
- Propose Joint manager role over four team leaders and a pool of 27 Inshore analysts and Kai Takawaenga;
- Propose change of role in inshore team to focus on species complex plans, reduction in proposed Kai Takawaenga team leader roles;
- Propose model for wider accountability for accountability for all Inshore teams for delivery on TOW obligations;
- Propose model to support capacity building in Inshore Group;
- Seek to make technical support available across whole of inshore and Kai Takawaenga teams to develop iwi and fisheries plans;
- Seeks to support direct discussions via Forums for conversations on iwi aspirations identified in Iwi Fisheries Plans;

- Needs to be clear who KTW will be working for in developing IFP ie iwi or Ministry; needs to be clear separation of KTW and IFPA;
- Improve and have clear links between Pou teams roles and Inshore fisheries team;

Poutakawaenga/Kaitakawaenga/ IFP Development

- PTW should continue to provide services Fisheries Act 1996 s12, Treaty of Waitangi (Fisheries Claims) Settlement Act 1992 s10 and protocols;
- Pou Takawaenga locations should be kept in the takiwa of the tangata whenua;
- Appoint only one team leader for Pou Takawaenga (can be based in any of the proposed locations);
- IFP – suggest iwi are scribes for this and KT to advise and work with PH to support and advise tangata whenua;
- Support - Evolution of Pou teams work to allow tangata whenua to more fully participate in fisheries management;
- Slight revision in IFP/IFP analyst geographic locations;
- Support placement of Pou Takawaenga in fisheries management (but as a semi-autonomous unit); expectation that they will continue to deliver input and participation/regard for Kaitiakitanga obligation; should appoint existing PTW to IFP roles (or internal contestability with tangata whenua involvement);
- Aiming for 60 plans in 5 years is ambitious;
- Support contracting but MFish needs to assist with the processes it needs to undertake. Contract positions need to be able to represent iwi interests across MFish activities;
- The Kai Takawaenga role should not provide for support for customary tools applications;
- Iwi Fisheries Plan Unit – Support approach but short term nature of plan development risks good staff seeking other opportunities;
- Pou Takawaenga staff should report to one manager with clear role and accountability;

IFP analysts

- Support IFP analyst positions;
- IFP Analysts (3) – ensure JD has relevant experience and qualifications in tikanga, mātauranga and maramataka in addition to te reo;
- Support - Strategic integration of IFP analysts with inshore;
- IFP advisors – support for positions, but critical the position is not assimilated (reassigned to other tasks), or seen to remove any obligations to Maori for other inshore analysts; a number of suggestions made to prevent this including having these positions as a separate unit (with Team Leader reporting directly to DCEFM); very clear PDA/KRAs; and oversight by DCETP and DCEFM;
- Iwi Fisheries Plan Analyst – support opportunity for cross training and upskilling of staff. Risk of resources being absorbed into inshore team rather than focussing on inputting iwi concerns into Fisheries Management plans - needs to be mitigated;
- Is three IFP Analysts enough? Increase the current three up to six from current pool of Pou Takawaenga;

IFP Manager

- IFP Manager – this position must be a stand alone manager of Kai takawaenga based in Auckland, Wellington, or Dunedin. The position description – delete Maori culture and replace with te Ao Maori and tahā Maori;
- In the past Pou Takawaenga have lost a manager, have had no clear leadership, have been handed to an interim manager and this has caused uncertainty amongst the team. Those processes should not be repeated and appoint a manager for the Pou Takawaenga who has sole responsibility and accountability for the Pou Takawaenga team;

- Support - IFP manager the same level as inshore;
- IFP manager should not have to be in Wellington (best person for job may not want to live there);

Resources - general

- Maintain and deliver on obligations to tangata whenua and provide a better and more efficient service;
- Need clarity on where resources will come from to service historic protocols and MOUs. It is unclear who will have responsibility for delivery on these;
- Support fair and equitable distribution of resources;
- Maintain develop and enhance existing resources;
- Support - retaining resources and redistributing for increases efficiency and effectiveness;
- Oppose reduction in staff numbers;
- Would like access to offices and facilities;
- Question value of resources spent on DCTP (rather than out at local level);
- Numbers of staff should honour previous commitments;
- Current level of engagement insufficient, don't want to see any reduction in resources;
- Scaling back of resources will diminish resources available for Maori to manage the marine environment;
- Resources are inadequate (for IFP; customary research fund);
- Need more resources (for Forums; customary research);
- What happened to the 9 DOSIP inshore analysts?

Understanding of /accountability to Maori

- All MFish staff should have an understanding of the obligations to Maori and how it relates to their roles through compulsory training and up-skilling on obligations and kaitiakitanga values;
- If the inclusion of existing Maori staff within the mainstream operations of MFish is intended to embed Maori values and understandings, that can be supported in principle;
- Accountable to Maori – not integration of Maori into mainstream;

MFish recruitment

- In making appointments MFish should consider including external expertise on tikanga and kaitiakitanga on the interview panel. Recommendations –
 - MFish should reassess the nature of its policies and delivery to Maori in terms of the issues set out in this and other submissions from NTB.
 - The nature of the redeployment of staff presented in the proposal can be supported but by requiring staff with the skill sets identified and using the appointment processes proposed in this submission;
- Tangata whenua should be given the opportunity to participate in designing/approaching the JDs for PH and PT and play a role in short-listing applicants;
- More clarity required for position descriptions;

Training required

- Key accountabilities in PH job descriptions require PH to provide advice and support, however there is no detail to suggest what advice support or training; Support improved and coordinated training of Pou staff and fisheries analysts on Iwi Fisheries Plans and Fisheries Plans;
- Build MFish staff capacity to understand tikanga Maori;
- Support increased career development opportunities for Maori staff;

- Support concept and approach provides natural progression for work with iwi. Risk losing staff because lack of long term role in plan development. Training and skills development is needed and managers need to have capability to lead and train staff in this new area;
- Kai Takawaenga will need to have a good understanding of Te Reo me ona Tikanga;
- Can we have assurance that staff in place can deliver to Maori on Treaty obligations. Te reo and tikanga is a pre-requisite for appointment of Kai Takawaenga.

2 **Iwi Fisheries Plan Implementation**

Iwi Fisheries Plans

- Support (customary) IFP;
- Support IFP development;
- Scale of IFP; new super-Forums and national fisheries plans will be difficult to align;- need to allow new forums to be of flexible size; and encourage IFPs to follow national fish plan structure (eg. shellfish; finfish; freshwater);
- Not sure that one size will fit all (some iwi following different approaches);
- Need clarity of the content of Iwi Fisheries plans and the application of the plans to sustainability measures and Fisheries Plans;
- Need clarity on content and how information in Iwi Fisheries Plans will be applied. MFish has changed tack from previous Fish Plans and certainty is needed;
- Role and powers of Kaitaki need review. Management should be articulated through hapu fisheries plans not through permits and reporting rules;
- IFP unit will be of value to iwi/hapu, need to be adequately resourced. How will the unit deliver leadership, credibility and empathy to all the treaty partners?
- Programme achievable but must have clear roles and responsibilities for different tasks and definite work programme and focussed resources to achieve goals;
- Would like to see mātaimai applications progressed before prioritising Integrated Fisheries Plans;
- IFP – suggest iwi are scribes for this and KT to advise and work with PH to support and advise tangata whenua;
- An IFP design team needs to be established (short term) to establish a plan framework and consistent themes and consistent with tikanga Maori;
- Kaitiakitanga is a complex concept;
- Develop an IFP template that can accommodate Te Ao Maori;
- Need local solutions for local problems;

Integration of non-commercial and commercial

- How Iwi Fisheries Plans and Fisheries Management Plans will integrate customary, commercial, recreational, freshwater and aquaculture interests is unclear;
- Integration of fisheries interests will be difficult;
- Acknowledge integration is important, but a difficult task;
- Support the development of an integrated approach to engagement with tangata whenua;
- Frameworks required around the work areas, eg IFPs;
- Unclear how integration can be successfully achieved (MIO representatives better resourced than non-commercial; skippers have more influence than quota owners; role of TOKM?);
- Need to ensure balance between the commercial and customary interests;
- Commercial interests must not dominate non-commercial; resourcing of commercial participation should not detract from resourcing of non-commercial participation;
- Support integration of commercial and non-commercial – but not sure how this will happen with so few Pou;

- Integration of commercial and existing customary forums a huge challenge;
- Do not support integration of commercial and non-commercial (at this time); but believe iwi fisheries plans should give effect to commercial and customary activity where they impact each other;
- Do not believe that integration of commercial and non-commercial will improve fisheries management; tangata whenua are being asked to do this task, but have not been provided with sufficient resources;
- Support integration of commercial and non-commercial;

Iwi plans need to built from hapu aspirations up

- IFP need to build up from hapu/ahi kaa to iwi;
- It will be difficult to “sell” iwi plans unless there is clear provision for hapu involvement. Risk of removing hapu rangatiratanga and plans being seen as MFish documents;
- Integration is not new to some iwi and goes wider than customary and commercial interests to environmental interests. Some support for moving forward but with decisions being taken at the right level by hapu and iwi reflecting manawhenua;
- Questions over implementation and if MFish have the skill base, if there’s no effective engagement with hapu and iwi how will the plans be developed?
- Recognition of hapu is important; need to sit alongside iwi;
- Ministry has obligations to hapu as well as iwi; should not shift to working with iwi; some flexibility is required (not just iwi plans, hapu/iwi plans); want the Minister to consider hapu based rohe plans in decision making;

Contract for service

- Support contract model;
- Support contract for services – believe gazetted regions, or regions trying to gazette but who are in dispute should have priority;
- Support contract for service, but specification and criteria must be very clear; (eg, current contract for service with BOP is for PH services but out of PTW budget);
- Wish to retain current Pou Takawaenga, and seek a contract for service for Pou Hononga position;
- How will process be established to ensure contracting out positions be managed to provide best value;
- Support options for secondment and contract;
- How will iwi/hapu for IFP be chosen?
- Criteria for contract for service need to be clear;
- Is gazetting of kaitiaki required before an iwi can develop and iwi fisheries plan and will Pou services only be available after gazetting?
- Contract of resources of \$300K wont be distributed fairly;
- How will \$300K be distributed across 59 iwi?
- How will service contracts be distributed fairly and equally for the whole country?
- If they don’t have Kregs will they have access to the services?

Input and participation process - or how will IFP information be used in decision making?

- Some areas have plans, like Kaipara, that MFish has ignored;
- Support Iwi Fisheries Plan analysts’ positions, Concerns over how analytical information will be presented to iwi and how iwi information will be presented and considered in Ministry Fisheries Plans;
- Need clear understanding of how Iwi Fisheries Plans will be given particular regard in Fisheries Plans before iwi will have an incentive to develop plans;

- Needs clear information loops between hapu/iwi and MFish. Plans need to clearly be seen to be benefiting both tangata whenua and MFish not simply meeting a Crown requirement;
- IFP development must be clearly linked/integrated with MFish fisheries plan development;
- Involvement in MFish fish plans needs to be from the beginning;
- Unclear how IFP will actually influence fisheries management decisions;
- Need to be clearer about how rohe moana plans link to iwi plan and how they are to be used in fisheries management decision making; How will tangata whenua input into MoF fisheries plans? How will FMA2 be resourced to input?
- Need to make clear where IFP will be held (and how used);
- Ministry needs to respond to issues raised by IFPs (including requests for increased resources);
- How will MFish respond if the integrated (customary and commercial) view of tangata whenua prioritises customary eg, mataitai?
- Who implements the IFP that we have already done (and where are the resources for this)?
- Effect of IFPs unanswerable as MFish policy for development of Fish Plans has not been released. If the prime role of IFPs is to provide input into FPs then their value will necessarily be limited. FPs will be determined at a high level, the local concerns of iwi and hapu will be difficult to provide for and the benefit of the expenditure of iwi time and resources on them will be questionable. If on the other hand IFPs are to directly influence fisheries management decisions then a tangible benefit can accrue. These differences are critical to the type of support that can be expected from iwi for the IFPs;
- If IFPs are to be effective they must enable an articulation of iwi issues in a form that is effective to address MFish management of fisheries resources. Input into the process from MFish should first be to clarify the status of the IFPs and how they will influence MFish policy and operations;
- Ngati Kahu would like to know how Mfish intends to give effect to any fish plans drawn up and would like a lot more discussion on the proposal to integrate Maori Fisheries;
- How will MFish ensure information in IFP is used appropriately? Possible monitoring role for DCETP?
- Shift to using electronic communication is supported, but should not replace kanohi ki te kanohi engagement;
- Question on Crown's understanding of Kaitiakitanga;
- Forum advice needs to be accepted and actioned. There needs to be clear governance and accountability to ensure iwi information is utilised in Fisheries Plans and sustainability decisions;
- Do not support reduction in face to face engagement (against tikaka; assumes all have electronic access);
- Lack of clarity on input and participation into fisheries management processes;
- Will iwi get input into development of five national plans;
- Information from MFish/Crown sources should be provided to hapu to be used in conjunction with traditional indicators and knowledge to manage the local fishery;
- Development of Fish Plans raised, and how this will occur;
- Want to be involved in deepwater management/plan;

3 Forum Implementation

National Forum

- Ngati Kahu support the introduction of a national forum as a way forward;
- Agree in principle to establishment of National Forum;
- Support evolution of National Forum;

- Support establishment of national body; will MFish support discussion by national chairs and iwi reference group?
- Support proposed National Forum – but need to know how it will be supported;
- A way to deal with a national forum concept is to establish north, central and southern forums;
- National forum engagement – TOKM note that their directors are appointed through a legislative process and that a national forum would no doubt have the same process, therefore duplicating the bodies;
- One size does not fit all as iwi and hapu are not in a position to nominate people who can represent both Maori commercial and non commercial arms;
- Do not support National forum;
- National Forum is a ridiculous idea;
- Te Kahui Maunga o Tangaroa should be recognised as the National iwi fisheries forum;
- Concept of national Forum needs to be discussed with hapu and iwi; support for Te Kahui Maunga;
- Support a Wai Pounamu/South Island Forum, not a national forum;
- Want representation on the Iwi Leaders Group;
- Do not support the development of a national forum based solely on Kaitiaki; do support the evolution of an Iwi based fisheries forum;
- Support national iwi fisheries forum;
- Hapu should sit alongside Iwi at the Treaty Partnership table;
- Support national Forum – but needs to reflect regional forum views;
- Will MFish support an approach to Pita Sharples for joint TPK/MFish support for National Forum?

New FMA aligned/super Forums

- Support regional Forums as conduit for aspirations in IFP;
- Support idea of FMA aligned groups for more effective input into MoF fish plans, but not sure how it will be achieved;
- Not clear that forum FMA alignment will work for freshwater interests – a different approach may be required to input into national freshwater fisheries plan;
- Ngati Kahu would like to know what MFish mean when they speak of rationalisation of forum within FMAs;
- FMAs are huge – so massive expectations of individuals coordinating Forum at these levels;
- Rationale for proposed new forum boundaries unclear;
- How will new ‘super-Forums’ be funded?
- Keep local and not FMA aligned;
- Continue fisheries forum collaborative partnership;
- Ngati Kahu would also like to see a direct link formed between neighbouring forum;
- Work on building mandated organisations (forums/iwi) and technical competence is unfinished. The consultation process indicates in terms of the Auckland hui (24th) indicates the need for either more work or a different approach;
- Have interests in two existing Forums, but have to carefully evaluate the value vs cost of participation;
- Keep forums local and not FMA aligned;
- Push for local focus.
- Want to continue to hold individual Forum meetings (as well as merged Forum hui once or twice a year);
- Forum evolution and national forum – manage forum expectations away from MOUs and reduce meetings from monthly to quarterly. Decisions should be made by iwi/hapu not

forums as forums are places to meet and disseminate information. Do iwi/hapu or the forum have a reporting process in place, are forum reps mandated to make decisions or take recommends back to iwi/hapu, do forum reps inform iwi of forum developments prior to sign off.

- Develop a forum intent statement and criteria and a set of risk management safe practice guidelines that are in line with Te Ao Maori. Suggest this be done by DCE TP team of Pou Hononga;
- Recommend MFish staff workshop this topic so that a strategy can be developed and also a safe practice guidelines;
- Regional forums must be sufficiently resourced;
- Forum framework required, safe practice guidelines;
- Hokianga Accord is the next generation integrated Forum model;

4 MFish Governance

DCE role and TOR

- The role of the DCE TP needs to be clearer;
- Need clear TOR for DCTP;
- Unclear from diagrams who is responsible for delivery on obligations;
- Support DCE Treaty Partnership role – but need committed person and team with capacity for role. Adequate processes and monitoring to make process work;

Engagement

- Iwi need access to all business groups in the Ministry that are working on issues of importance to iwi;
- Hapu should sit alongside Iwi at the Treaty Partnership table;
- Ministry should consider how it can provide tangata whenua with a single point of contact for all issues;

Settlements

- Strategy/Policy need to ensure the implementation arm of MFish is included in negotiations;

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Need to improve outcome definition to ensure integration into MFish performance monitoring (lists 12 useful examples);
- Not sure how Monitoring and Evaluation team will monitor Pou (if they do not have an understanding of things Maori), should be done by DCTP;
- Monitor role risk and evaluation team – this team will need to clearly understand Te Ao Maori or the monitoring role be appointed elsewhere – perhaps an external provider;
- Evaluating the Treaty strategy and OMP needs to be done;

Communication

- Who will be responsible for external communication?
- How will methods of management be communicated? Who will be responsible for external communication?

Organisational Governance

- It is also unclear who has accountability for – producing a Ministry Treaty strategy work program (for coherence); overseeing / coordinating implementation of the work program and monitoring, evaluating and adjusting the work program?

- Need improved Ministry governance and management of the Treaty strategy work. The proposed internal governance arrangements look similar to those that existed historically and these had weaknesses. Attention needs to be placed on how the internal governance will function differently from the old arrangements;
- There is overlap between the three Mfish governance groups in the proposal and the role or need for these different groups should be discussed and clarified;

5 Other Issues

Consultation /Timeframe for Decisions

- Need to make decisions on review before key staff are lost. Key staff are important to relationship and future success of programme;
- Short time to respond to proposal unacceptably short and has restricted ability to consult whānau and hapu before making response;
- Question value of meeting with only TRONT; question value of entire consultation on proposal;
- Questions consultation process – views being requested but not taken into account;
- Strongly of the view that there needed to be more time for discussion of the proposal – in order to allow views of marae and hapu to be heard;
- It is unreasonable to expect iwi to take a stance on these issues without putting the issues to our hapu and marae committees;
- Concerned that time frame for iwi to respond to proposal is far too short . Resolution passed to extend submission period to March 2010;
- Believe a decision needs to be made promptly (to ensure no further staff losses);
- It is important to provide for review of the proposed model (with tangata whenua input);

Review Process

- Pou Takawaenga should have been part of the review team (PTW generally support proposal but do not consider they have been fairly treated) – makes it difficult for them to take ownership of decisions;

Name change

- Not clear why need for name shift from ‘Pou Takawaenga’ to Kai Takawaenga;
- Should not change name from Pou to Kai Takawaenga;]
- Pou Takawaenga - name should not be changed;

Engagement

- Reject Ministry engagement model (in general); consider it only lip service; Head Office doesn’t listen; not a partnership model;
- We want a relationship with the new aquaculture agency (recommended by aquaculture TAG);
- Mfish should consider a public register of who they recognise to deal with customary fisheries matters;
- Engage in a more time effective manner;
- Cultural impacts of lessening kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) engagement;
- New fisheries management approach emphasises development of frameworks. Respect for each other essential to building enduring relationships and partnerships;
- Mfish should identify where the relationship is at with each iwi and hapu around the country through a relationship audit;

Whole of government approach

- I & P – a whole of government approach needs to be designed;
- The RMA box in the diagram indicates a whole of govt approach is attempted here although it is not clear;
- The understanding of kaitiakitanga by the Ministry and by Tangata whenua is different. Kaitiakitanga interconnects land water resources and people. Crown processes should harmonise the many different coastal management regimes;
- Agree with better linkages with other agencies to enable holistic approach by iwi and whole government approach by Crown;
- Encourage inter-agency development of plans (to reduce spatial nightmares);
- A responsibility for management of fisheries resources must address land based activities with marine impacts;

Customary Regulations/ Customary tools/Customary management

- Need to better manage customary catch information (and return information to hapu/iwi);
- Concern about delays in processing mataitai applications (maybe no is better than deferral);
- Backlog of mātaitai applications, customary research etc...and the proposal isn't clear how this will be resolved;
- Not clear where responsibility for progressing promulgation of special customary fishing regulations for Titi Islands lies. Moving the work to another unit could create significant delays;
- The regulations encourage iwi to move towards mataitai; Ministry should provide assistance through rohe moana and mataitai process;

Education (tangata whenua and MFish)

- Need more effective education around settlement protocols;
- Need for capacity building of tangata whenua (range of options listed);
- Capacity building education projects for Kaitiakitanga through collaboration with other agencies;
- Concern customary regulation education will not be prioritised and be conducted by staff unaware of regional dynamics – with no service in Kaitaia how will momentum continue?
- Recommend some training be based on Te Ao Maori;
- Education and training – unclear whose role it is to train kaitiaki – need a single accountable point;
- Possibility of additional duties to be added over time (eg, education; research assistance; assistance for iwi/hapu to deal with whole of government);
- Support the views expressed by all Maori submitters and that those views are taken into account. Build the capability of tangata whenua to engage with MFish staff;

Regional issues

- MFish needs to be support of a framework for sustainable community development;
- MFish focus in their region has been on compliance;

Settlements

- There's a revamp of customary fishing arrangements through settlements ;
- Believe Mfish seeing Te Runanga o Te Rarawa as insignificant because they're not a protocol iwi;
- Ngati Pahauwera trustees signed an Agreement in Principle last year, aiming to have their Deed of Settlement completed in the new year. How can NP be assured their interested in fisheries will be managed appropriately? Ngati Pahauwera should be considered as having iwi status (claimant definition of 80 Hapu);

- Concern proposal based on iwi and not Treaty Claimant Groups or large natural groupings – how can this be addressed?
- Support effective implementation of iwi protocol arrangements;

Other

- Need better estimates of recreational catch;
- Stock take of customary research funding (based on clear resource allocation criteria to tangata whenua) and alignment to support rohe moana/IFPs;
- Without an inquiry into the nature and extent of the customary fisheries right any MFish initiatives to deliver on customary fishing will be limited and often inappropriate or irrelevant;
- Support for honorary fisheries offices coming from iwi;
- The new process should be reviewed in 2011.
- Question over status of staff on secondment into team;